



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Rev. Hugh P. Smyth

C 7519.19.10



**HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY**

The Reformation

The Reformation

**By the
Rev. Hugh P. Smyth**

SECOND EDITION

**Extension Press
180 North Wabash Ave., Chicago
1922**

C 7519.19.10



Nihil Obstat

P. L. BIERMANN,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur

GEORGE WILLIAM MUNDELEIN,
Archbishop of Chicago.

Copyright 1919

By EXTENSION PRESS

Reprinted November, 1922

All Rights Reserved

Printed in U. S. A.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.....	7
CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION.....	9
THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY	23
THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND	46
THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND	64
THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND	87
THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND	113
THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE	130
THE REFORMATION IN DENMARK	134
THE REFORMATION IN NORWAY	137
THE REFORMATION IN SWEDEN	139
THE REFORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS	143
TO THE GENERAL READER.....	146
THE COUNTER REFORMATION	150
TO THE CATHOLIC READER.....	160
THE ANABAPTISTS	165
THE BAPTISTS	167
THE CONGREGATIONALISTS	170
THE EPISCOPALIANS	172
THE METHODISTS	175
THE PRESBYTERIANS	179
THE QUAKERS	182
THE UNITARIANS	185
THE UNIVERSALISTS	187
THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR.....	188
OTHER CONSEQUENCES OF THE REFORMATION.....	194
THE WEAKNESS OF PROTESTANTISM.....	203
THE OUTLOOK FOR PROTESTANTISM.....	212
A WORD ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.....	222
WHY DOES NOT THE CHURCH YIELD A LITTLE?...	225
THE PRESENT PROSPECTS OF CATHOLICISM.....	229
A FINAL WORD	238

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

I deem it my first duty to thank our Catholic papers and periodicals for their kind reception of "The Reformation." I did not expect such a favorable criticism.

I have endeavored in this second edition to correct such typographical errors as appeared in the first. I have also tried to make plain the meaning of a few expressions which might easily be misunderstood. An index is now added to the work.

I realize that some very important questions are treated all too cursorily in the book, but I could not make the changes recommended without going beyond the scope of the work. Nor did I correct the repetitions that have been noticed, because I do not think that they seriously lessen what value the book may have. Besides, they had worked themselves into the text, and perhaps to good purpose.

A Protestant criticism, to the effect that I give a one-sided statement, is easily met. I quote Protestants on Protestantism, the friends of the cause on the cause. Had I asked Catholics to testify against Protestantism I might reasonably be accused of unfairness. Similarly, had I cited Protestant opinion of the Catholic Church I would not only depart from my subject, but I would be submitting the testimony of an enemy—a mode of procedure everywhere considered less than honest.

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE

Seven of these discourses were delivered at St. Mary's Church, Evanston, during the Lent of 1918. They were prompted by the continued misrepresentations, by local teachers, of the Catholic Church in Reformation and pre-Reformation times. Confiding pupils listened to the old story that Protestantism has been telling, in its own justification, for four hundred years. Their teachers apparently, in many instances, never heard that there was another side to the question, nor that modern scholarship had shown a Luther and a Calvin very different from the reformers of their dreams.

In dealing with the matter, I have quoted from Protestant authorities almost exclusively. I cite Catholic authors but two or three times, and then only on questions of undisputed fact.

I had numerous requests that the discourses should be published in some form. In acceding to what seemed a demand, I decided to add to the seven original discourses, in order to show briefly how the Reformation spread into the

smaller nations, and how it manifests itself in the better known of the multitudinous sects of today.

It will be seen that from the standpoint of doctrine the Reformation, as it is commonly understood, had but two great teachers, Martin Luther and John Calvin. Unitarianism is Socinian, hence of the sixteenth century also. But it really dates back to Arianism in the fourth century. It received a new impetus in Reformation times. Yet, in popular estimation it is not identified with the innovations of the sixteenth century.

In church polity Protestantism retains, though it usually modifies, and often mixes, the Lutheran and Calvinistic ideas. Luther, it will be remembered, made the State supreme in spirituals; Calvin would have the Church dictator even in temporals. The Anabaptist view, which made the Christian man independent of both Church and State, hardly exists in our day. But we find what must be considered an improvement of it in the attitude of Baptists and other Independents, who refuse to permit interference by the State in church matters.

CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION

The International Encyclopædia says the movement called the Reformation would be more properly designated a revolution; and the Britannica apologizes for the use of the word Reformation, which, it says, is not of the present-day historian's making, but is handed down. Cobbet, long ago, speaking of the religious change in England, declared it not a reformation, but a devastation. These authorities, all Protestant, express the views of the candid historian of today.

But reformation or revolution, it ranks among the first movements of all history, has had a tremendous effect upon the world for four hundred years, and is likely to remain potent for ages to come. Was it necessary? How came it about?

Reformation has always been necessary and always will be—reformation of society, reformation of the individual. Every examination of conscience, every confession, every act of sorrow, every New Year's resolution, every mission,

every Lent, all are efforts toward reformation. The time immediately preceding Luther's revolt was particularly in need of a change. Not, indeed, that indifference and sin had become universal, as the historians of the Reformation have so often declared. God and morality had still many witnesses, and genuine efforts against depravity were many and ceaseless. But, nevertheless, we have the authority of sincere Catholics of the time, even of the Council of Trent, that reformation was necessary.

But there is another question: how could a people looking for real reform listen to such men as the reformers were? Their lives are today an open book, and not one of them bears inspection. Luther, the best known and most influential, was a coarse, brutal fellow, who regarded no law except his own will. Judged by any recognized standard, he was a man upon whom even apology is wasted. The conscience of the world demands that the physician should heal himself, that the reformer should be of unimpeachable character. Surely the apostate Wittenberg monk does not answer such a test. How, then, could he bring about a reformation, or

even a revolution? How could he have made such a stir in the world?

A combination of circumstances, such as had not been before and hardly can occur again, enabled this obscure, rebel priest to defy the Church and bring about a change in Europe that amazes us today, as we look back upon that dread movement. What were the circumstances?

We shall first consider the governing church. It will be remembered that in the Middle Ages the power of the papacy was so great that worldly men often ambitioned it, and princes strove to advance their favorites to the exalted height. In 1305 the king of France succeeded in having a Frenchman chosen to the chair of Peter. The new pope, Clement V, yielding to the king's representations, and, perhaps, also fearing the political factions in Rome from whom popes had previously to fly, determined to remain in France. He took up his residence, after four years of wandering, at Avignon, where for seventy years he and his successors resided. This period is known as the Babylonian Captivity of the Church. Away from the Eternal City and residing in an obscure French town,

the papacy forfeited considerably its influence, and, in public estimation at least, lost much of its independent and international character.

The Babylonian Captivity came to an end in 1377, but was soon followed by something worse. The Western Schism arose in 1378 and continued to humiliate and distract the Church for forty years. Gregory XI, the last of the French popes, brought the Babylonian Captivity to a close by transferring the papal court from Avignon to Rome. He died soon after, and an Italian, who took the name of Urban VI, was elected to succeed him. The French influence was not satisfied, and proceeded to elect an anti-pope, who took up his residence at Avignon.

When the pope and anti-pope died, their successors were chosen by their respective followings, and the wretched division continued until 1409, when it became still more complicated. A council assembled at Pisa — a council that had no right to assemble, and hence no authority to transact business. Nevertheless, it undertook to depose the pope and anti-pope, and proceeded to elect one of its own choosing. The distracted Church now saw three claimants to the chair

of Peter, each one having his backing and support from the secular powers. The sincere Catholic who preferred his religion to any faction was at a loss to know which way to turn. He knew that one of the claimants was pope, but which one he could not say.

This sad situation came to a close after forty years with the election of Martin V. But it left an aftermath that seriously impeded the work of the Church in subsequent years. The various factions that supported the rival claimants invariably sought the aid of the secular powers. Temporal rulers were therefore brought into the affairs of the Church; and they resolved to stay. Until the Council of Trent the Church was not free to carry out her work in her own way. Further, during the period, unworthy men succeeded to the high dignity of the papacy, Alexander VI being one of them.

When the Reformation broke out, Leo X occupied the chair of Peter. He was of the Medici family, the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent; and while there is nothing said, or to be said, against his personal character, he was not the man to cope with the situation. His ambi-

tion was to build St. Peter's and to check the advance of the Turk. He cared little about what seemed to him to be simply a quarrel between monks. During all these years, wise and good men were calling for a general council, which alone could remedy the evil conditions of the time. One cause or another interfered until, in 1545, the Council of Trent assembled.

But what was the condition of the clergy as a body? Here I would remind you that the clergy as a body depend upon two factors: the people from whom they spring, and the schools in which they are taught. There will be departures from this rule. Some will rise above the conditions out of which they came; some will descend below them. But the general body will be what these two circumstances make them. Ecclesiastical training, as we have it today, dates from the Council of Trent, and did not exist before that time. From the fifth century to the thirteenth, students for the ministry were trained in cathedral schools under the eyes of the bishops. In the thirteenth century the university arose, and, as it grew, the cathedral schools declined, and ultimately disappeared. A small percentage of

the clergy attended the universities; the majority received their education in a hap-hazard way. In the fourteenth century the universities became largely secular, and hence the young Levites who attended them received a secular education. Thus it happened that they did not get the proper training for the high vocation they were to follow.

Besides this, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the clergy were practically the only ones who could boast of an education. They, consequently, filled such offices of state as required clerical training. They were thus withdrawn from the service of the Altar, and compelled to lead lives that were largely secular. Later, without merit and without zeal, simply through the favor of some baron or princeling, these men were often promoted to the episcopacy. Is it any wonder that ministerial zeal should decline under such circumstances?

But, if clerics invaded and held offices that should have belonged to seculars, and would, had the latter been qualified, laymen retaliated by seizing positions in the Church. The sons of nobles, idle and self-indulgent fellows, often

were made abbots of extensive monasteries. The unmarried daughters of rich houses entered convents, solely for the purpose of occupying positions of honor and emolument. They obeyed no rule, accepted no discipline. Both monasteries and convents necessarily suffered from such invasion. The Church suffered from the double intrusion, that of the clergy into offices of state, and that of the laity into the government of the Church.

Nor may we forget the intermittent conflict that existed between the temporal and spiritual powers from the beginning of the ninth century. This often became very acute. The fifteenth century, especially, witnessed a prolonged struggle between the Pope and Emperor. Even when the trouble was composed, bitter memories remained, and wounds refused to heal. Unquestionably these struggles prepared the way for the religious revolution of the sixteenth century.

Another factor was the rebirth of learning known to history as the Renaissance. This movement began in Italy with Petrarch about the middle of the fourteenth century. It was an effort to supplant the somewhat barbarous lan-

guage and culture of Europe by the introduction of classic learning. Later, it received a new impulse from the arrival in Italy of that distinguished Greek scholar, Manuel Chrysoloras. Manuel had been sent by the Greek emperor, Manuel Palæologus, to implore the aid of the Latins against the Turks who were threatening Constantinople. The envoy took a position in the University of Florence, where he taught Greek and attracted to the school scholars from all Europe. Interest in Greek culture grew apace, especially after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, when many scholars and much Greek literature came into western Europe.

The age of the Renaissance is not a great age. There is nothing brilliant or heroic about it. It invented nothing, but simply aimed at following the classic models in literature, philosophy, and art. The worship of art for art's sake began with this period. Those who took up the new learning were called humanists, because they were supposed to have given up the divine for the human. Not, indeed, that all gave it up. Some, it is true, became pagans, pure and simple. Some remained staunch Catholics. Some were mystics.

A mystic, such as I have in mind—I am not speaking of those wonderful men and women who, like St. Bernard, St. John of the Cross, St. Teresa, St. Gertrude, are regarded as genuine mystics—is a person who holds firmly to a religious belief without any reason for his or her faith. A Catholic who accepts the teaching of his church is not such a mystic, since he has sufficient grounds for faith in the fact that the Church, whose inerrancy is guaranteed, teaches it. The devotee of the camp-meeting, who gets religion and never afterwards can doubt, is a mystic. And I do not know but your Christian Scientist, who cares not for all your objections and arguments, is a mystic. Luther was a mystic. He did not pretend to give any reason for what he taught. He called reason a “pretty strumpet.”

The Renaissance, however, did not alienate men from the Church generally. Leo X and the Medici family favored the new learning, as it was called. So did Sir Thomas More, who was known as the first layman of Europe, and who went to the block for his faith under Henry VIII. Erasmus, too, and a multitude of others

remained staunch in the faith, while devoting themselves to classic studies.

It was a time of unrest from every point of view. The peasants were grievously oppressed. Many of them were scarcely able to eke out a living. Taxes or contributions to either Church or State seemed a painful exaction. The introduction of the Roman code of law worked new hardship. So wretched was their condition in Germany that in a few years after Luther's rebellion came the Peasants' Revolt.

Nor must we forget that the spirit of nationality which had then, for the first time, taken definite shape in Europe, gave an impetus to rebellion. It was easy enough to convince an Englishman or a German that he ought not to be subject to an Italian, even in spirituals. He objected especially to paying tribute to a foreigner.

As if to add to the condition of general unrest, great discoveries set men's minds agog with expectation. Gunpowder, invented some time before, was coming more and more into use. The art of printing, discovered in the fifteenth century, so changed conditions that books, which

were before the luxury of a few, became the common property of all who desired to read. But beyond all, the discovery of America opened a new and exceedingly promising field to enterprise. Every student of history knows how disturbing such opportunities may be.

It was therefore a period of unusual turmoil and unrest. Opposition to foreign dominion, jealousies and mutual hatreds at home, new inventions and discoveries, offering vast opportunities to ambition, a hungry peasantry, greedy nobles, scheming, petty rulers (and there were three hundred of them in Germany), the Church demoralized from the causes already named, the State anxious for dominion even in spirituals—these were the agencies that prepared the way for the huge upheaval which men call the Reformation.

Back of all this was the everpresent desire of novelty and change; the rebellion of the flesh against restraint; the rebellion of the proud spirit against authority. These things are always with us and grow more violent in days of passion and excitement.

Such was the situation, especially in Germany,

when Leo X commissioned the friar, Tetzl, to preach indulgences and to ask for money with which to build St. Peter's and do battle against the Turk.

Whether Tetzl exceeded the due limit or not, is a disputed point. But this made no difference whatever. For, whether he adhered to strict doctrine or not, his mission was unpopular, and an attack upon him and his preaching would be welcomed.

This was Luther's opportunity. Not, indeed, that he had any plan, or that he dreamed of the length to which he was to go. Nor is it of interest to inquire whether Luther was, or was not, prompted by jealousy of Tetzl. The fact was that the friar was asking money from a wretched peasantry and impoverished nobles for the building of a church on the banks of the Tiber.

Luther's system developed slowly, for he accommodated himself to all who might be willing to break with the past. The peasants were pleased to hear that a priesthood is not necessary. Every Christian man, he teaches, shares in the priesthood. They needed no teacher, no guide. Private judgment became supreme. God's word

was to each one what he thought it to be. There was no need of building churches or supporting a hierarchy. The princes were promised control in spirituals, as well as in temporals, each in his own dominion. But, above all, prince and peasant were taught that there was no further need of battling with passion or denying appetite; no need of chastising the body and bringing it under subjection. Faith alone saved. Good works did not avail. Sin, if such a thing could be, did not interfere with one's prospects of salvation. It was a very consoling doctrine in those days of strife and passion.

Such was the situation, and Luther was, above all others, the man of the hour. He was not a scholar, but he had a commanding eloquence of a popular kind which stirred his followers to their depths. He changed, shifted, temporized, or advanced, as the situation might require. In this manner he brought about what is possibly the greatest revolution of all time, something he could never have accomplished had not the situation been as I have described it.

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY

In dealing with the Reformation in Germany, we cannot make much mistake in keeping close to the career of him who was its master spirit — Dr. Martin Luther. He was certainly the first in importance, as he was in time, of the great reformers. Even today, should any one mention the Reformation, the rotund figure of the ex-Augustinian friar rises up before the imagination. No influence was or is so widely felt as that which the preacher of Wittenberg brought to bear upon the Christian world of his day.

Martin Luther was born in Eisleben, Saxony, in the year 1483. He was thirty-five years of age when he commenced his sensational career as a reformer. He was, from an early age, sensitive, morose, gloomy, and subject to fits of melancholy. His parents, like himself, were hot-headed, and sometimes brutal. The punishments they inflicted upon him remained with him as a source of irritation through life. His home was not a happy one.

In school, too, though quick to learn, industrious and of a retentive memory, he was often punished. These early humiliations and beatings still further aggravated a temper that was naturally proud and rebellious. At the age of eighteen he entered the University of Erfurt, where he displayed considerable ability. At the age of twenty-two, against the will of his father, who intended him for the law, he sought refuge in an Augustinian monastery at Erfurt.

The causes which led to this change of plan are not quite certain. It is thought that he was unwilling to return to a home that had no attraction for him. Again, it is asserted that the shock he received from the sudden death of a companion brought the hasty change. Another view is that Luther's inability to regulate his passions on the one hand, and his fear of hell on the other, determined him to seek the security and aid of the religious life. Whether it was any one of these causes, or all of them combined, the fact is that at the age of twenty-four he was an ordained priest of the Augustinian order.

His superiors showed him many signs of confidence. He was sent on a mission to Rome;

was appointed Lecturer on Theology at the University of Wittenberg, and pastor of a church in that city.

As pastor he came in contact with Tetzels preaching of indulgences. Whether the Dominican friar went too far or not, has remained a disputed question. But it seems quite evident that he left wrong impressions; and when Luther inveighed against him, many loyal Catholics welcomed the attack. There was too much of such preaching at the time, and whether the preachers mis-stated the doctrine or not, their hearers often carried away extravagant views on the efficacy of indulgences. Luther was not the only one who saw and deplored this. Indeed, bishops had not infrequently forbidden such preaching in their dioceses.

The trouble with Luther was that he did not himself know what was, and is, the Church's teaching on the subject. Great natural ability is not a substitute for accurate information. When, therefore, the reformer entered into discussion with such masters as Eck, he was hopelessly worsted in the debate. This his proud spirit could not brook. Exasperated by defeat,

he willfully championed views which he at first uttered in ignorance, and thus gradually placed himself in an attitude of opposition, not only to indulgences, but to the authority of the Church.

He vacillated a good deal, as one not sure of his ground, perhaps not sure of the support he sought for. At one time he professed profound submission to the pope; at another he called the pontiff antichrist, or his apostle. The inevitable result of his views, and of his stubbornness in maintaining them, was the excommunication which came in 1520, less than three years after his dramatic nailing of the ninety-five theses to the door of his church at Wittenberg.

His answer to this was the public burning of the papal bull and with it the books of canon law. The breach was now complete, and Luther stood fairly in opposition to Rome, in defiance of its authority, in repudiation of its doctrine. He must shift for himself and secure such a following as the circumstances of the times might promise. Anyway, his would not be a tame submission or an obscure existence.

To formulate a theory of church polity was his immediate work. He must also have a doc-

trinal system that would enable him to set up an organization in opposition to the one from which he had been cut off. The history of his progress in building up a dogmatic edifice is interesting, if sometimes unintelligible and baffling. He had many things to take into consideration—his own needs, the prejudices and predilections of those he would win to his cause, the securing of authority for himself after his repudiating the authority of the Church Universal. No easy task, this. But it must be granted that he succeeded beyond his most sanguine expectations. If he was not a great theologian, he was certainly a masterful politician; and as such he never allowed principle to stand in his way. He changed his dogmatic views and his ecclesiastical policy whenever the situation seemed to demand this. His most vicious doctrine, I think, is denial of free will. Man's nature, he said, has been corrupted by the fall, and we are quite incapable of willing, except as guided by a stronger power. Our works are not our own, whether they be good or bad. This doctrine was evidently evolved out of his own fruitless struggle against temptation. As already said, the story of his life

indicates that he was the victim of strong passions, which he failed to control, and which, when indulged, sent him into the depths of gloom and remorse.

As a necessary aid to this condition the sufficiency of faith was evolved. Man cannot avoid sinning, but he must save his soul. What is he to do? Believe; simply believe. This is all he can do; this is all he needs to do. If the old teaching of Christendom is against this, he takes exception to the teaching. He goes to the Bible as the only source of enlightenment. If the Bible is opposed to his theory, he will repudiate it, in part, and will interpret to suit himself what he does not repudiate. The right he claims for himself he concedes to others, at least in theory.

Here, then, is the system in a nutshell: faith alone, the Bible alone, interpreted by yourself alone. Any Christian man knows more about the subject than the Universal Church. The new faith was evidently subversive. No previous heresiarch ever went so far. But it must not be expected that Luther would live up to his own principles. If he gave his followers the Bible, he insisted that they should accept *his* interpre-

tation of it; if he destroyed the old Church, he would raise on its ruin one of his own creation; if he dethroned the pope, he would set himself up with an arbitrary power such as no Roman pontiff ever assumed.

His relations to the civil power show Luther as a master in the art of chicanery. He was under the ban of the empire, but he found strong protectors in local rulers whose passions he humored, whose greed he would satisfy. The Peasants' War, the result of his teaching, forced him to throw himself upon the nobility, who were eager enough for change, and still more bent upon securing a share in the vast estates of the monasteries. By taking advantage of the general unrest, and by catering to the passions of those who could bring strength to the cause, he succeeded in dividing Germany into warring factions, with the result that internecine strife, continuing for a generation, all but devastated the land.

I shall not further pursue the story of the movement, a story upon which modern writers are throwing new light, but shall instead devote myself to the work that Luther accomplished for

the world. The average college pupil is told by his professor that whatever of freedom or enlightenment Christian peoples have today, dates from that memorable day the thirty-first of October, 1517, when Luther pinned his ninety-five theses to the church door at Wittenberg. The disciple eagerly swallows the teaching of the master and preaches it to his juniors. The world has come to regard the ex-Augustinian monk as the champion of our liberties against the tyranny of Rome; as the one who lifted learning from the slough into which it had sunk in the Middle Ages; and as the great moral force in the world of the last four hundred years. As the reformer of morals, the champion of enlightenment, the bountiful giver of civil and religious liberty, Dr. Martin Luther is made to stand before the world. Let us see.

In discussing this matter I shall call to witness none but Protestant authorities. First, we shall consider him as a "reformer of morals." I shall call as first witness Edward Maslin Hulme, professor of history in the University of Idaho, and a good Protestant. I quote from his work, "The Protestant Revolution and the Catholic Refor-

mation in Continental Europe," a work which he tells us is based upon "Outlines of the Renaissance and the Reformation," by Professor George Lincoln Burr of Cornell. The testimony then rests upon double authority. In this work, published by the Century Company in 1915, Professor Hulme, page 366, says:

"In opposition to the Catholic salvation by good works, the revolution had emphasized justification by faith alone. Some of the extreme Lutherans even asserted that good works were prejudicial to salvation. In doing this they emptied faith of its essence and left it little else than a mere acceptance of the dogmas of their church. Jacob Andreae, canon and chancellor of Tübingen, said that 'as the doctrine of justification by faith alone was preached, the ancient virtues vanished and a crowd of new vices appeared in the world.' Bucer, who helped to establish Protestantism in Strasburg, said that 'corruption makes further strides every day in the Evangelical Church.' Melancthon averred 'not all the waters of the Elbe would be sufficient for me to weep over the evils of the Reformation.' And finally Luther himself said 'that there

is not one of our evangelicals that is not seven times worse than before he belonged to us.'"

Hallam, the Protestant son of a Protestant clergyman, in his "Literature of Europe," Part I, page 303, says, "In maintaining salvation to depend on faith as a single condition, he (Luther) not only denied the importance, in a religious sense, of a virtuous life, but asserted that every one who felt within himself a full assurance that his sins were remitted (which, according to Luther, is the proper meaning of Christian faith) became incapable of sinning at all, or at least of forfeiting the favor of God, so long, but so long only, as the assurance continued." In his (Luther's) treatise, *de Captivitate Babilonica*, we find these celebrated words: "Ita vides quam dives sit homo christianus et baptizatus, qui etiam volens non potest perdere salutem suam quantiscumque peccatis, nisi nolit credere. Nulla enim peccata eum possunt damnare nisi sola incredulitas," which I translate freely as follows: "So you see how rich the baptized Christian man is, since even though he should desire it, he cannot forfeit salvation, no matter how often he sins: unless he refuses to

believe. Sins, no matter how numerous or grievous, cannot damn him if only he clings to faith." This is morality with a vengeance.

Van Hutten, a follower of Luther, wants Erasmus to come to them. Erasmus answers, "To whom? To those who are good and are actuated by the true gospel teaching? I would willingly fly to them if anyone will point them out. If I know of any Lutherans who, in place of wine, prostitutes and dice, have at any time delighted in holy reading and conversation; of any who never cheat or neglect to pay their debts, but are ready to give to the needy—if he can show me such people, he may count on me as an associate. Lutherans I see; but followers of the gospel I can discover few or none." Erasmus remained a Catholic, but one who freely criticised abuses.

It will be recalled that Luther, "for the glory of God and the good of religion," gave his dear friend, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, permission to take to himself a second wife. Of this Dr. Lindsay, principal of the United Free Church College, Glasgow, a Protestant divine (M. Luther, Ency. Brit.), says: "His (Luther's) weak-

ness brought the second great blot on his career. The document sanctioning the bigamy of the Landgrave was signed by Bucer, Luther, and Melancthon, and is a humiliating paper. It may be thus summarized: According to the original command of God, marriage is between one man and one woman, and this original precept has been confirmed by our Lord; but sin brought it about that, first Lamech, then the heathen, and then Abraham took more than one wife, and this was permitted under the law. We are now living under the gospel, which does not give prescribed rules for the external life and has not expressly prohibited bigamy. The law of the land expresses the original commandment of God, and the plain duty of the pastorate is to denounce bigamy. Nevertheless, the pastorate, in single cases of direst need, and to prevent worse, may sanction bigamy in a purely exceptional way. Such a bigamous marriage is a true marriage in the sight of God (the necessity being proved), but it is not a true marriage in the eye of public law and custom. Such a marriage, and the dispensation for it, ought to be kept secret. If it is made known, the dispensation

becomes *eo ipso* invalid and the marriage is a mere concubinage." So long as the bigamy remained secret it was all right, even in God's sight!

But how could a man who denies the utility of good works be a reformer? How could one who denies freedom to the human will be a reformer? If men cannot help themselves they ought not to be bothered.

As to his championship of civil freedom, let us consider his attitude towards the Peasants' War in which 100,000 of them were slain. I quote from the Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, page 193:

"Terror and his proximity to Thuringia, the scene of the most violent and dangerous form of revolt, while they may palliate, cannot excuse Luther's efforts to rival the brutal ferocity of Munzer's doctrines. He must have known that the princes' victory, if it came at all, would be bloody enough without his exhortations to kill and slay the peasants like mad dogs, and without his promise of heaven to those who fell in the holy work. His sympathies with the masses seem to have been limited to those occasions when he

saw in them a useful weapon to hold over the heads of his enemies. He once lamented that refractory servants could no longer be treated like other cattle, as in the days of the Patriarchs; and he joined with Melancthon and Spalatin in removing the scruples of a Saxon noble with regard to the burdens his tenants bore. 'The donkey will have blows,' he said, 'and the people will be ruled by force'; and he was not free from the upstart's contempt for the class from whom he sprang. His followers echoed his sentiments; Melancthon thought even serfdom too mild for stubborn folk like the German peasants, and maintained that the master's right of punishment, and the servant's duty of submission, should be unlimited."

From Professor Hulme again, page 256:

"When Luther saw that his advice (to the peasants) was not heeded he began to denounce the insurgents. He said, 'Peasants must bear the crack of the whip and the whiz of the bullets; if they refuse to obey, let the cannon balls whistle among them, or they will make things a thousand times worse.' Doubtless, in addition to being disgruntled with the refusal of the peasants to

follow his advice, he feared that the social revolution would endanger the success of the ecclesiastical revolution of which he was the leader. Whatever may have been his reason, his invectives against the rebels became ever more vehement. 'Dear Lords,' he urged, 'smite, stab, destroy. . . . Whoever dies fighting for authority is a martyr before God. . . . I pray every one to depart from the peasants as from the devil himself.'"

Dr. Lindsay, already referred to, says, "Luther issued a pamphlet which casts a stain upon his whole life, in which he hounds the ruling classes to suppress the insurgents with all violence."

The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, page 191, says that as a result of dealing with the peasants as Luther recommended, "To the end of the eighteenth century the German peasantry remained the most wretched in Europe. Serfdom lingered there longer than in any other civilized country, save Russia."

How about religious freedom? Let us hear Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, Vol. I, page 372:

"An unbounded dogmatism, resting on an

absolute confidence in the infallibility, practically speaking, of his own judgment, pervades his (Luther's) writings; no indulgence is shown, no pause allowed, to the hesitating; whatever stands in the way of his decisions, the fathers of the Church, the school men and philosophers, the canons and councils, are swept away in a current of impetuous declamation; and as everything contained in the Scripture, according to Luther, is easy to be understood, and can only be understood in his sense, every deviation from his doctrine incurs the anathema of perdition. That the Zwinglians, as well as the whole church of Rome, and the Anabaptists, were shut by their tenets from salvation is more than insinuated in numerous passages of Luther's writings."

Green's History of the English People, Vol. II, page 122:

"From the golden dream of a new age wrought peaceably and purely by the slow process of intelligence, the growth of letters, the development of human virtue, the reformer of Wittenberg turned away with horror. He had little or no sympathy with the new culture. He despised reason as heartily as any papal dogmatist could

despise it. He hated the very thought of toleration or comprehension. He had been driven by a moral and intellectual compulsion to declare the Roman system a false one, but it was only to replace it by another system of doctrine just as elaborate, and claiming precisely the same infallibility."

Edward Maslin Hulme, page 363:

"In spite of the existence in the sixteenth century of such (Coornhert's) views of toleration, all of the men who led the various revolts from Rome believed in the purging of heresy by fire and sword. In the new evangelical creeds there was contained no element of tolerance. They paid homage to the principle in the time of their development, when they had everything to hope if only they were secured against external opposition. But when they were safely entrenched they would have nothing to do with it. Luther was the first to assert not only the right, but the duty of the civil authorities to permit the preaching only of what was recognized by them to be the true word of God. The reformers came to look upon intolerance as a law of self-preservation. Luther anathematized every one whose

belief differed from his own. 'He who does not believe my doctrine,' he once said, 'is sure to be damned.'"

The Cambridge Modern History says, "the maxim *Cujus regio ejus religio* is as fatal to true religion as it is to freedom of conscience."

The motto *Cujus regio ejus religio*, everywhere adopted in Lutheran states, destroyed all liberty of conscience in the subject. The ruler alone enjoyed freedom. It was his privilege to choose what religion he pleased and impose it upon his subjects. Luther would himself be glad to force his religion upon all, but he had to make concessions in order to win the secular princes. The unfortunate people had no choice but to accept what was given them. This is the "freedom of conscience" that Luther gave the world. You have but to consult any candid historian to learn that this situation existed wherever Luther's teaching prevailed. The Encyclopædia Britannica says "Freedom of conscience was established for princes alone and their power became supreme in religious as well as secular matters."

We shall now consider Luther as the cham-

pion of learning. I quote from Professor Hulme once more, page 367:

"The new theological interests that were created began to thrust the work of secular scholarship into the background. 'The triumph of the Lutherans,' says Erasmus, 'is the death of good learning.' And the immediate influence of the revolution in Germany was such as to justify the worst fears of the prince of humanists. The cause of culture was lost in the bitterness of polemics. The spirit of free inquiry engendered in the age of the Renaissance degenerated into dogmatic disputation. Luther damned the intellect as the bride of the devil; and Calvin declared natural science to be godless and harmful. Luther wished to humiliate reason, even to annihilate it, in order to make man more dependent on faith. . . . Each of the new state churches developed a new scholasticism which was distinctly hostile to freedom of thought."

From Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, page 278:

"The Reformation began with ideas and ended in force. . . . The methods of blood and iron supplanted the forces of reason. No ideas in

religion or politics could survive unless they were cast in the hard material mold of territorialism." The writer concludes the chapter by saying: "From the time of Charles V (Reformation time) to that of Frederick the Great, Germany ceased to be an international force; it was rather the arena in which the other nations of Europe, the Spaniard, the Frenchman, the Swede, the Pole, and the Turk, fought out their diplomatic and military struggles. . . . The vigorous city life of the Middle Ages was a thing of the past. . . . On the shores of the Baltic the destruction of town independence involved the loss of Germany's maritime power, and not until our own day has this eclipse begun to pass. With the decay of civic life went also the ruin of municipal art and civilization. . . . No age in Germany was more barren of intellectual inspiration than that which succeeded the peace of Augsburg. The internecine struggles of the reign of Charles V had exhausted all classes in the nation, and an era of universal lassitude followed: intellectually, morally, politically, Germany was a desert, and it was called Religious Peace."

Erasmus declared that the Reformation put back the work of education a hundred years.

If Luther did not elevate morals or stimulate learning, or bring us civil or religious liberty, what did he do? What claim has he upon the world of thought and action? Well, he gave the Germans a Bible that has remained a genuine contribution to their literature; indeed, is considered a classic. It is not an accurate translation, but it has high literary merits. This, however, is rather an aid to a language than a contribution to religion.

Is this all? No, this is not all. He established schism and heresy in western Europe, destroyed the unity of the Church, sounded the death-knell of missionary work, inaugurated a policy of hatred that still continues to curse Christendom.

But he freed men from the necessity of battling against passion, and he right cordially hated the pope. G. K. Chesterton tells the story of a Belfast Orangeman who, when about to die, on being asked to give some manifestation of the faith that was in him, raised himself upon his elbows and, with all the energy left him, shouted, "To hell with the pope." How that Orangeman

and Luther would have understood one another! There was not a day of the reformer's existence that he would not doubly damn the pope. On one occasion, in parting with his friends, he prayed, "May God fill you with His blessing and with hatred of the pope." Again, "I will curse and scold the scoundrels until I go to my grave." This is really his chief claim upon the affection of his followers. For as a reformer he denied or destroyed anything and everything that would make reform possible.

Luther's life was not a happy one. Towards the end he was wretchedly miserable. He was not quite pleased with his work, and the passions which he unchained were working mischief among his followers. His own habits of indulgence in eating and drinking had their effects upon his health. This was especially felt in his declining years.

But he left a legacy of hatred of Rome that continues to the present day. If the celebration of the four-hundredth anniversary of his nailing the ninety-five theses to his church door has been a failure, and if the religion he taught would hardly be recognized by him today, still his influ-

ence upon the world is vast, and, no doubt, will continue to be. Reformer or deformer, evolutionist or revolutionist, he was and is a striking figure in history. But if the religion of Christ is one of brotherly love, the religion of Luther is something very different.

THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND

In dealing with the Swiss Reformation, I shall again keep close to a personality. The one I shall choose will not be the fighting parson of Zurich, Ulrich Zwingli, though he was the first in the field; indeed, a contemporary of Luther, with whom he disputes priority in the matter of reform. Towering high above the Zurich pastor stands the severe figure of Jean Calvin, known to history as John Calvin.

This noted reformer was born in Picardy, France, in 1509. Luther was then a priest and Augustinian monk. Calvin came from a refined home, and was brought up in aristocratic surroundings. He had all the advantages of education that the humanistic enthusiasm of the time gave, and he availed himself of his opportunities with indefatigable zeal. He was a tireless student, of great ability, studied under the best masters, and, it is said, never took a vacation. A master of the French tongue he became profi-

cient in many others, and was on terms of friendship with the scholars of his time. He had the advantage of considerable travel, and was in every sense a man destined to make his mark. He was also a man of correct moral habits.

Intended at first for the service of the Church, he later changed his purpose, and, with the consent of his father, who had acquired a new ambition for his brilliant son, took up the study of law. Hence, John Calvin, differing from most of the reformers, never became a priest.

Calvin experienced a "sudden conversion," such as quite recently would be associated with camp-meetings, about the age of twenty-two. Whether his father's difficulties with the local church authorities had anything to do with it, I do not know. Luther's doctrine, if not accepted, was at the time quite generally discussed in France. Wandering students had brought it from one university to another, and learned bodies experienced the unrest which came from the Renaissance and the German Reformation. A very aggressive sect of religionists known as the Anabaptists were giving trouble in France, as they had in Germany. They were opposed to the

civil magistracy; indeed, were anarchists. They were denounced and in some measure outlawed. Calvin, in order to separate himself and his followers from the proscribed sect, wrote his "Institutes of the Christian Religion." It is a comparatively small work, but one that has influenced the Reformed Church from that day to the present; a work, too, which, though written when its author was but twenty-six, has been little modified since. The keen reasoning of Calvin gave his particular form of Protestantism an enduring textbook. Yes, even a textbook that has imparted color to all forms of Protestantism. It moulded the church of Switzerland, France and Scotland; gave inspiration to Puritans, Congregationalists, Dissenters, Baptists; even aided in moulding Anglicanism; and, in common with Lutheran theories, forms the established church of Prussia. It is, in fact, the very soul of Protestantism. Luther made more noise. He got the attention of the world. But Calvin sowed the seed that germinates in the stern forms of Protestant theology.

It will be seen, therefore, how different were these two reformers: Luther, plebeian, burly,

coarse, aggressive; Calvin, delicate, aristocratic, refined, shy; Luther, demagogue, shifty politician, master of vulgarity; Calvin, polished orator, incisive reasoner, mordant critic. What Luther hoped to accomplish by abuse, Calvin would attain by earnest argumentation. Their methods of dealing with the civil powers also varied. Luther would give the prince who accepted his doctrine supremacy in spirituals; Calvin would subjugate him even in temporals. Zwingli had attempted to establish a theocracy in Zurich. Calvin effectively established it in Geneva. The Swiss policy differed completely from that of Wittenberg.

Calvin's first attempt to enforce the law of God with the aid of the civil magistracy failed in Geneva. He was driven out after two years of trying. But he was not the man to give up the struggle. He kept advising his friends as to the best manner of campaigning for his return. He was invited back, and, stronger than before, he effectively lorded over the city during his life.

The tyranny for which Calvin was driven out may be seen in any writer who deals with the period. He drew up a confession of faith, and

demanded that the fifteen thousand inhabitants of the city should sign it. They were summoned in parties of ten "to profess and swear" to the doctrine thus forced upon them. Those who refused found Geneva an uncomfortable place. The Anabaptists were driven out of town.

The Britannica says: "The strictness with which the ministers (Calvin and Farel) sought to enforce not only the laws of morality, but certain sumptuary regulations regarding dress and mode of living of the citizens . . . led to violent dissensions."

The principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, Dr. Fairbairn, writing in Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, after lauding Calvin as few men are lauded, says, on page 367: "Since matrimonial cases were many and infelicity sprang both from differences of faith and impurity of conduct, a board composed partly of magistrates and partly of ministers was appointed to deal with them. It had power to exclude from the Church all who did not believe its doctrines or did not obey its commandments. . . . A man accused of a social sin was driven with the partner of his guilt through the streets by the common

hangman, and then banished. A card-player was pilloried; a tire-woman, a mother, and two brides-maids were arrested because they dressed a bride too gaily. Hence men who came to be known as Libertines, though they were patriotic and moral, and only craved freedom, rose and said, 'This is intolerable tyranny and we will not allow any man to lord it over our consciences.'"

Again the same writer speaking of the consistory Calvin established after his return to Geneva: "It was a judicial body that met every Thursday to examine charges of misconduct and immorality, to pass sentences from which there was no appeal, and to hand over the guilty to be punished according to law. If any offender refused to appear a civil officer was sent to bring him. Obstinate refusal to communicate was regarded as a crime, so was absence from the church, disrespect of parents, blasphemy. One young woman who sang profane songs was banished, another who sang them to psalm-tunes was scourged. Heresy became as much of an offence as immorality. To speak against the creed was treason. A character without reproach only aggravated the crime."

Geneva, under Calvin, furnished the model that our own puritans tried to follow. His views on religion and morality must prevail both in Church and state. The Swiss city became an exceedingly hot place for those who ventured to differ from the reformer. To such extent did the tyranny go that, as a recent authority says, "Within five years forty-eight sentences of death and seventy-six of exile, besides numerous committals of the most eminent citizens to prison, took place in Geneva," all for conscience's sake.

But the most noted case was that of Servetus, who was condemned to burning at the stake, for having differed from Calvin. This was the case that so deeply scandalized Gibbon. Calvin's admirers try to justify or excuse the crime. But candid historians agree with the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. Calvin, which says: "It can be justly charged against Calvin in this matter that he took the initiative in bringing on the trial of Servetus, that as his accuser he prosecuted the suit against him with undue severity, and that he approved the sentence which condemned Servetus to death." What a travesty on civil and religious liberty, perpetrated by men who

had in the name of liberty thrown off the yoke of Rome! It has been alleged, as some compensation for this species of tyranny, that Geneva shone out as a moral city, especially in contrast with the cities of Germany where Luther's teaching had taken hold. No doubt Geneva was moral, as a jail or a reform school may be moral, through compulsion.

But who would have morality, desirable as it is, at the price? Liberty of conscience was denied. The dread doctrine which Calvin taught was crammed down the throats of all classes. Free assent was not supposed to count for anything. The same compulsion that regulated faith also dictated conduct. The morality of Geneva was born of fear, and therefore, in the strict sense of the word, no morality at all.

But Calvin's policy of dominating in spirituals and temporals, objectionable and intolerable as it was, pales into insignificance when compared with the monstrous doctrine which he palmed off on the world as Christian teaching. This fearful doctrine has made millions of atheists. Honest, justice-loving men, mistaking Calvinism for Christianity, have turned against the religion

of Christ and have blasphemed the God of Christianity. When infidel and atheist rail most loudly against the faith, it is the faith as proclaimed by Calvin they have in mind. Calvinistic theology has revolted thinking men beyond measure. The pagans often considered that the favor of the gods was won or lost without either merit or fault on the part of the worshiper. But it is safe to say that no pagan deity was ever made so arbitrary and fitful as Calvinistic theology makes the great Jehovah, whose dread punishments are inflicted where there is no fault, whose ineffable rewards are bestowed upon men and women who have done nothing to merit them.

I quote some of Calvin's views: "Man by the rightful impulsion of God does that which is unlawful; man falls, the providence of God so ordaining. Some men are born devoted to certain death, that His name may be glorified in their destruction. He foresees future events only in consequence of his decree that they should happen. It is an awful doctrine, I confess, but none can deny that God foreknew the future, the final fate of man, before He created him, and

that He foreknew it, is because it was appointed by His own ordinance."

All is decreed by Divine Providence, even Adam's Fall. God chooses from all eternity, without any reference to foreseen merit or demerit, some to eternal life, others to eternal death. Though the elect and the reprobate should lead the same kind of lives, perform exactly the same kind of works, whether bad or good, the one goes to Abraham's bosom, the other to the eternal pit. The decree which fixes the future of each one born into the world is eternal, absolute, and unchangeable. No life of virtue, no course of sin, can change it. If you are chosen you cannot forfeit your heirship; if reprobate, no penance can help you. What a monstrous doctrine, what blasphemy against the Most High!

Rev. Wm. Lindsay Alexander of Edinburg, Scotland, and Rev. Alexander James Grieve of Bradford, England, two learned divines of Calvinistic training, authors of the article on Calvin in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, give a summary of Calvin's doctrines as follows: "Depravity and corruption, diffused through all parts of the

soul, attach to all men, and this first makes them obnoxious to the anger of God, and then comes forth in works which the Scripture calls works of the flesh. Thus all are held vitiated and perverted in all parts of their nature, and on account of such corruption deservedly condemned before God. . . . From Adam not only has punishment overtaken us, but a pestilence instilled from him resides in us, to which punishment is justly due. Thus even infants, whilst they bring their own condemnation with them from their mothers, are bound not by another's but by their own fault. For though they have not yet brought forth the fruits of their iniquity, they have the seeds shut up in them; nay, their whole nature is a sort of seed of sin, therefore it cannot but be hateful and abominable to God.

“The assurance which the believer has of salvation he receives from the operation and witness of the Holy Spirit: but this again rests upon the divine choice of man to salvation; and this falls back upon God's eternal sovereign purpose, whereby He has predestined some to eternal life, while the rest of mankind are predestined to condemnation and eternal death.”

James A. Froude says: "To represent man as sent into the world under a curse, as incurably wicked—wicked by the constitution of his nature, and wicked by eternal decree—as doomed, unless exempted by special grace which he cannot merit, or by any effort of his own obtain, to live in sin while he remains on earth and to be eternally miserable when he leaves it—to represent him as born unable to keep the commandments, yet as justly liable to everlasting punishment for breaking them, is alike repugnant to reason and conscience, and turns existence into a hideous nightmare."

A. H. Johnson, M. A., historical lecturer, Trinity College, Oxford, in his "Europe of the Sixteenth Century," page 275, says "that the religion he (Calvin) established, if not exactly ascetic, was gloomy beyond measure; that it has inspired no art except, perhaps, certain forms of literature; that his principles of church-government, though founded on a democratic basis, in practice destroyed all individual liberty; that, so far from advancing the spirit of toleration, they necessarily involved persecution—all this must be admitted. His strong predestinarian

views, if logically acted up to, ought to have led to a fatalistic spirit most dangerous to morals, . . .”

Most of the hatred, that has been the bane and reproach of Christians, is born of Calvinism. Calvin hated, and justified his hatred by the example which, he blasphemously asserted, the great Creator gave. Since God loved and hated without reason or cause, why should not we? Calvin was sure of his own election. This conviction came to him, not through any process of reasoning, but from an interior voice which spoke to him in accents that left no room for doubt. He felt it. Had he arrived at the persuasion through any efforts of his own, he would have been assisting God—something that his system declared impossible. The elect, of which he was one, were beloved of God. He was, therefore, with the Almighty, loving what He loved, detesting what He detested. Calvin was convinced that the Lord hated all who differed from him. Calvinism not only justified, but made imperative, that which Christ's teaching unmistakably forbids.

Such convictions as these necessarily made

Calvin a bitter and relentless enemy. When, however, this dread doctrine had taken possession of a mind made irritable by sedentary habits and ill-health, the condition became worse. A mind perverted by a cruel theology was linked to a body made sore by many pains. His dyspepsia and head-aches wrote themselves into all he wrote, spoke themselves into all he spoke, wrought themselves into all he wrought. The religion he left the world is gloomy and severe. He was opposed to the arts and amusements that brighten and cheer life.

Though Calvin, dismissing the past with its Christian tradition of fifteen hundred years, resolved to go back to the Written Word, yet he seemed afraid to proclaim the dread decrees on predestination without some sanction from the Fathers of the Church. He found, or thought he found, something to his purpose in the works of St. Augustine, especially his argument against the Pelagian heresy.

A word about Pelagius may enable us to understand the situation. Pelagius was a monk, though never a priest, who came to Rome from Britain, or as one authority would have it, from

Ireland, about the close of the Fourth Century. He was a very able man of austere habits and, 'to all appearances, of saintly life. Provoked, no doubt, at the tendency to throw the work of salvation solely upon divine grace without proper effort on one's own part, he advanced the view that an earnest man who gave himself to austere habits could save his soul by his own unaided efforts. Against this teaching which is known to history as the Pelagian heresy Augustine entered the lists. Naturally, in a controversy of this kind, a disputant confines himself to one side of the question. In this case Augustine gave his attention to the necessity of grace. A well recognized tendency in the reformers and their followers up to the present is to take a text or a chapter and interpret it by itself, without any regard to other utterances or writing coming from the same source. Calvin seized upon certain expressions of Augustine's which seemed to make for his theory, and failed to read them in the light of the illustrious author's other teaching. The student of St. Augustine's writings knows that this great theologian made predestination depend upon God's foreknowledge of

our lives and actions. Calvin, as we have seen, makes it completely independent of any such knowledge. This the meaning of the eternal, absolute (unconditioned) and irrevocable decree. Had Augustine taught the doctrine that Calvin would find in his writings, instead of being considered one of the most illustrious of the Fathers of the Church, his works would be on the Index. The Church owes much to Augustine, as it does to Aquinas, but it was not to either of them that Christ said "Thou art Peter (a rock) and upon this rock I will build my Church." But the great African Father taught no such doctrine as Calvin insisted upon finding in his controversy with Pelagius.

Calvinism broke into sects early in its history. There were those who held as Calvin did, that even Adam's Fall was brought about by the decree of God. Others considered the Fall man's own work. Many came to deny the doctrine of the Trinity. The Unitarians of our own day are the children of the Swiss Reformation.

It is not at all necessary to accuse Calvin of insincerity. He was in large measure the victim of circumstances; of the troubled times in which

he lived, of the situation in France and in Geneva. He was, as already said, a man of great industry and austere morals. These qualities often bring with them an imperious will. His sensitive and irritable disposition, aggravated by ill-health, did much to color his thoughts and mould his theology. The logical keenness of his reasoning led him to carry his principles to great extremes. Luther stopped short and even changed his course when he found himself hurrying to alarming conclusions. Calvin pushed his principles to the limit no matter what the consequences. There was just one conclusion necessarily following from his premises that he would not admit. God, he held, brought about man's sin, but yet He was not the author of sin. No one except Calvin has ever been able to see how this escape is made. If God, from all eternity, decreed, absolutely and irrevocably, that certain men and women should be damned; and, in order that there might be reason for damning, He brings it about that they shall sin, how, in the name of common sense, can one hold that He is not the Author of the sin? Yet Calvin held it. Of course, his followers today, unable to stand

the shame of this eternal, absolute, and irrevocable decree, have changed the doctrine somewhat. But in its original form it permeates all Protestant religious literature, and is an excuse for atheistic attacks on Christian teaching which Calvinism claims to represent. What a fearful caricature of the benign doctrines of Christ Calvinism is! What a travesty upon that most cordial invitation, "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened"! That it could be evolved out of a well-meaning brain, is another proof that man at his best is a weak creature, prone to error and to hatred of his kind. Without the guidance of the old Church, which, notwithstanding sin's ravages, remained and remains an unerring guide, the keenest intellect may run into absurdity and extravagance. Had Calvin devoted his great talents and energy to the work of true reformation under the direction of the Church, what might he not have accomplished in those troubled times that needed men of earnestness and ability! But he allowed himself to be ruled by pride and hatred, and in his ill-advised zeal evolved a religion that blasphemes God and embitters man; a religion that has brought so much opprobrium upon the Gospel of Christ.

REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

I

As we have seen, the Reformation in Germany was brought about by a rebellious monk who succeeded in winning to his cause many secular princes. Switzerland owed its religious revolution largely to a lay theologian possessed of great ability, though without place or power. The Reformation in England was the work of a man who had both place and power, but, from the standpoint of the spirit, little else. In England, the King alone sought for a change, and even he would be satisfied with such change of discipline as would allow him another wife. On the Continent, theologians forced their will upon princes and peoples. In England, the King dominated both Church and State.

The children of the English Reformation, in our country called Episcopalians, disclaim all relationship with Henry. It is a species of ingratitude of which the great Tudor Monarch, were he living today, might reasonably complain.

In the year 1509, the year that witnessed the birth of John Calvin, Henry VIII ascended the throne of England. The young monarch was the most popular and most promising prince in Europe. He was possessed of a fine presence, good mind, the scholarship of his time, and, what endeared him to his subjects, he was a splendid athlete. Soon after taking up the reins of power, at the age of eighteen, he married Catherine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella. Catherine, who was his senior by a few years, had been married, after the manner of child-marriages, to his brother, Arthur, who died at the age of sixteen. Though the contract with the boy Arthur did not constitute an absolute and irrevocable bond, it gave rise to an impediment known to the Church as affinity. This impediment is the creation of Church law, and the Church has the power to dispense with her own laws.

Pope Julius II granted the necessary dispensation, and with it Henry and Catherine entered into true and lawful wedlock. Five children were born of this union, of whom but one survived, Mary, afterwards Queen of England.

After seventeen years of married life, Henry began to have conscientious scruples. He thought it unlawful that he should have his deceased brother's wife. It is surmised that his theology, for he dabbled in that science, took its color from his desire of a male heir. To place a woman upon the throne of England would be a grave innovation, and Mary alone remained to him. A lady-in-waiting to the Queen, one Anne Boleyn, helped along his misgivings.

He would ask the pope to declare his marriage with Catherine invalid, a declaration that would open the door to his desires and ambitions. His Holiness, he assumed, should grant this little favor to the royal house of England and to a king who had taken up the cudgels against the German disturber, Martin Luther. In order to aid the pontiff in reaching the desired decision in the matter, the King sought to secure from the universities an opinion adverse to his marriage with Catherine. It is alleged that money was used freely in this campaign of enlightenment, but without definite result. Some, indeed, answered as his majesty desired; others were emphatic on the opposite side. The pope fol-

lowed his own lights and denied the King's plea.

But Henry was not a man to be baffled in a matter so dear to his heart. If he were himself head of the Church in England, he could readily find the accommodation he desired. It was a time of unrest, a time when other princes, far inferior to himself in distinction and talents, had assumed control in spirituals. Why not he? He would not change the religion or the Church, only its headship. He might have become a follower of Luther whose work of reformation had made much progress at the time. Luther would have welcomed him and given him all the wives his heart might desire. But Luther's abuse of his majesty was too recent to be forgotten. He would not go to Wittenberg or pay tribute to the apostate monk. He would continue the old church and assume its headship. But for appearance's sake, the King had to act through one of his divines. A willing tool was found in the person of Cranmer, who had been on the Continent, had imbibed the principles of the Reformation—and the practices too—for he had taken to himself a wife. This he did se-

cretly since the old canons enjoining celibacy upon the clergy still remained in force.

Cardinal Wolsey's failure to secure the divorce had brought upon him the wrath of the King, with such penalties as usually followed in the wake of Henry's displeasure. Cranmer, whom Henry had appointed his successor, would accomplish the work that Wolsey failed in. He was an able man, not altogether without conscience, but still one who, though married and a Lutheran, could accept the primatial see of Canterbury while England was yet Catholic. He also found it possible to declare Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn valid in 1533, and invalid three years later. He changed his views to suit each situation. He recanted his recantations seven times. His "besetting sin," according to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "was infirmity of moral purpose," or, as someone else puts it, "He was too fearful about what might happen to him."

Another remarkable figure came to Henry's aid at this time in the person of Thomas Cromwell, lay vicar general of the Church, a man to whom bishops and archbishops had to bow. Of

him the Britannica says: "In estimating Cromwell's character it must be remembered that his father was a blackguard and that he himself spent the formative years of his life in a vile school of morals. A ruffian he doubtlessly was. . . . His atrocious acts were done in no private quarrel, but in what he considered to be the interests of his master and the state. Where these interests were concerned he had no heart and no conscience and no religious faith." With the aid of two such instruments Henry began the Reformation.

Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, granted Henry the divorce he sought. The King had, however, married Anne Boleyn secretly some months before. The pope declared the marriage with Catherine valid. Henry's answer was an act making himself head of the Church in England. Cromwell, though his vicar general, had charge only of discipline. Questions of doctrine were decided by the King himself. He had enacted what is known as "the Statute of the Six Articles." Those who denied any one of them were punished—sometimes at the stake. Catholics, among them the most illustrious in

the realm, were sent to the block for denying the King's supremacy in spirituals, while Anabaptists suffered similar penalties for denying the doctrine of the "Bloody Six Articles." Monasteries were suppressed, their properties confiscated to fill the King's coffers and enable him to enrich his supporters. The rebellion of the northern counties, known as the "Pilgrimage of Grace," a popular rising against royal sacrilege, was suppressed with some difficulty.

Henry's trago-comic marriages have furnished humiliation and amusement to the world. He changed his wives six times in ten years. The first was divorced, the second beheaded, the third died in time to escape his wrath, the fourth was divorced, the fifth beheaded, the sixth survived her monster husband.

The clergy constituted another class of victims. They were all threatened with the celebrated enactment known as "praemunire," which implied any kind of punishment Henry's servile courts might inflict. They were, further, all suspended from office and had their faculties restored only by applying to the layman, Cromwell, vicar general of all England. Such was

the man and such the agencies through which the work of the Protestant Reformation in England was begun.

Lest I might be accused of dealing unfairly with "good King Hal," I shall quote the opinions of Protestant authors who cannot be accused of partiality to the Catholic Church.

Lord Macaulay, who is certainly Protestant enough, in his *History of England*, Vol. I, page 60, says: "The founders of the English Church wrote and acted in an age of violent intellectual fermentation, and of constant action and reaction. They therefore often contradicted each other, and sometimes contradicted themselves. That the King was, under Christ, sole head of the Church was a doctrine which they all with one voice affirmed. . . . What Henry and his favorite councillors meant, at one time, by the supremacy was nothing less than the whole power of the Keys. The King was to be the pope of his kingdom, the vicar of God, the expositor of Catholic verity, the channel of sacramental grace. He arrogated to himself the right of deciding dogmatically what was orthodox doctrine and what was heresy. He proclaimed that all

jurisdiction, spiritual as well as temporal, was derived from him."

Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England*, says: "Very few appear to have been aware that his name would descend to posterity among those of the many tyrants and oppressors of innocence, whom the wrath of heaven has raised up, and the servility of men has endured."

The same author, in Vol. I, page 42, says: "After the fall of Wolsey and Henry's breach with the Roman See, his fierce temper, strengthened by habit and exasperated by resistance, demanded more constant supplies of blood. It was made high treason to deny the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown, which until two years before no one had ever ventured to assert. Bishop Fisher, the most inflexibly honest Churchman who filled high station in that age, was beheaded for this denial. Sir Thomas More, whose name can ask no epitaph, underwent a similar fate. A considerable number of less distinguished persons, chiefly ecclesiastical, were afterwards executed by virtue of this law."

Green, *History of the English People*, Vol. II, page 161 and following:

“Under Cromwell the coercion of juries and the management of judges rendered the courts mere mouthpieces of the royal will, and where even the shadow of justice proved an obstacle to punishment, Parliament was brought into play to pass bill after bill of attainder. . . .

“His (Cromwell’s) blows were more effective because he chose his victims from among the noblest and best. . . .”

At the death of Cromwell “The old liberties of England lay prostrate at the feet of the King. The Lords were cowed and spiritless. The House of Commons was filled with creatures of the Court and degraded into an engine of tyranny. . . .

“One of the first bills of Cromwell’s parliaments freed Henry from the need of paying his debts, one of the last gave his proclamations the force of laws. . . .

“It was by Parliamentary enactment that the English Church was reft of its old liberties and made absolutely subservient to the Crown. . . .

“By a bill of 1545 more than 2,000 chantries

and chapels were suppressed to the profit of the Crown."

G. K. Chesterton, *Short History of England*, page 165, says: "Henry was very popular in his first days. . . . In his last days he was something like a maniac. He no longer inspired love, and even when he inspired fear, it was rather the fear of a mad dog than of a watch dog. In this change doubtless the inconsistency and even disgrace of his Bluebeard weddings played a great part. And it is but just to him to say that perhaps, with the exception of the first and the last, he was as unlucky in his wives as they were in their husband. It was undoubtedly the affair of the first divorce that broke the back of his honor. . . . The pope denied the new marriage, and Henry, in a storm and darkness of anger, dissolved all the old relations with the papacy. . . . Henry not only cut off England from Europe, but he cut off England from England."

It must not, however, be supposed that the English people submitted tamely to the suppression of the ancient faith. A rebellion, already hinted at and known as the "Pilgrimage of Grace," arose in the Northern counties, gained

great force, and marching under the banner of St. Cuthbert, demanded the restoration of the monasteries and the reinstatement of the monks. Had this movement a competent leader there is no telling what the result might have been. As it was, the King and his advisers, by feigned interest and false promises, baffled and defeated the rebels. Their leader was duly hanged.

Alzog thus sums up the King's work of slaughter:

"Henry during his reign put to death two queens, two cardinals, two archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred priors and monks, thirty-eight doctors of divinity and laws, twelve dukes and earls, one hundred and sixty-four gentlemen, one hundred and twenty-four commoners, one hundred and ten ladies."

As parliament, following the decision of Cranmer, had declared Henry's marriages with Catherine and Anne Boleyn invalid, Mary and Elizabeth must bear the stigma of illegitimacy, which excluded them from the throne. Edward, a mere boy, succeeded his father. I shall dwell but little upon his contribution to the work of the Reformation, as this was necessarily the plan-

ning of others. At the age of nine he was King of England and Ireland, and supreme head of the Church in those realms. The Reformation, through the activities of his managers, made rapid progress during the six years that this pampered, stubborn child reigned.

Mary, daughter of Catherine, succeeded him. A serious difference of opinion as to the wisdom of her policy exists even among Catholics. That she endeavored to bring back England to the one Christian fold is, of course, evident. Whether her methods were always wise, and whether she was, or was not, influenced by the bitter memories of her mother's sufferings and her own, is a question I shall not discuss at present. Her reign was but brief; that which followed it unusually long, extending over forty-five years.

The Britannica says of Mary: "Her name deserves better treatment than it has generally met with; for she was far from cruel. Her kindness to poor people is undoubted, and the severe execution of her laws seemed only a necessity. . . . Her conduct as queen was certainly governed by the best possible intentions; and it is evident that her very zeal for goodness

caused most of the trouble she brought upon herself."

Elizabeth, daughter of Henry by his second wife, Anne Boleyn, whose marriage was declared void from the beginning, succeeded Mary in 1558. She was a woman of remarkable ability, keen insight, and political cunning. She probably had neither much hatred nor much love of the old religion, or of the new. She followed Catholic practices during Mary's reign, was crowned with Catholic ceremonial; but this is no proof that she held to the old faith. Certain it is, however, that she loved power and prestige. She would be Queen of England. But both Church and State had declared her illegitimate, and therefore ineligible to the throne. The state repented, and changed its views; the Church did not and would not. There was, then, nothing left to her but to oppose the Church, which she did with her whole heart. Under penalty of death she reimposed the royal supremacy in matters religious. A woman as head of the Church was something novel among Christians. But Elizabeth did not shrink from the ridiculous innovation. On the contrary, no man, lay or cleric,

could find security for life or property in the realm without regarding her majesty as defender of the faith and keeper of his conscience.

Regarding the character of this new head of the Church, I quote the following:

Green says, Vol. II, page 304: "No adulation was too fulsome for her, no flattery of her beauty too gross. She would play with her rings that her courtiers might note the delicacy of her hands; or dance a coranto that an ambassador, hidden behind a curtain, might report her sprightliness to his master. Her levity, her frivolous laughter, her unwomanly jests, gave color to a thousand scandals. Her character, in fact, like her portraits, was utterly without shade. Of womanly reserve or self-restraint she knew nothing. No instinct or delicacy veiled the voluptuous temper which broke out in the romps of her girlhood and showed itself almost ostentatiously through later life. Personal beauty in man was a sure passport to her liking."

Again Green says, page 308: "Nothing is more revolting, but nothing is more characteristic of the Queen, than her shameless mendacity. It was an age of political lying, but in the pro-

fusion and recklessness of her lies, Elizabeth stood without a peer in Christendom. A falsehood was to her an intellectual means of meeting a difficulty. . . . As we track Elizabeth through her tortuous ways of lying and intrigue, the sense of her greatness is lost in a sense of contempt."

The Britannica, speaking of Elizabeth's escapades, says: "The unprincipled adventurer (Lord Seymour) even before his wife's death paid indelicate attentions to Elizabeth. . . . When Seymour's misbehavior led to his arrest, his relations with Elizabeth were made the subject of a very trying investigation, which gave Elizabeth her first lessons in the feminine arts of self-defence. . . . Her courtships were diplomatic. Contemporary gossip, which was probably justified, said that she was debarred from matrimony by a physical defect. . . . She was far too masculine in mind and temperament. . . . Impossibility of marriage made her all the freer with her flirtations, and she carried some of them to lengths that scandalized a public unconscious of Elizabeth's security."

Macaulay's History, Vol. I, page 61, says: "When it was objected that St. Paul had spoken

of certain persons whom the Holy Spirit had made overseers and shepherds of the faithful, it was answered that King Henry was the very overseer, the very shepherd, whom the Holy Ghost had appointed and to whom the expression of St. Paul applied. These high pretensions gave great scandal to Protestants as well as to Catholics. And the scandal was greatly increased on the accession of Elizabeth. It seemed monstrous that a woman should be the chief bishop of a Church in which the Apostle had forbidden even her voice to be heard."

He then speaks of the manner in which both the Church of Rome, and of Scotland, fought for their liberties against royal aggression; then adds: "The Church of England had no such scruples. By royal authority alone her bishops were appointed. By royal authority alone her convocations were summoned, regulated, prorogued and dissolved. Without the royal sanction her Canons had no force."

The bishops, excepting one, refused to recognize in Elizabeth the head of the Church and were removed from office, men of no training taking their places. The new religion as by law

established was still further changed. Catholics and Dissenters were subjected to the same penalties. After Elizabeth's excommunication the condition of Catholics became immeasurably worse. It was now high treason to deny her supremacy in spirituals, or to hold any kind of correspondence with the pope. Refusal to attend the established services was punished by all manner of penalties. Inquisitors were appointed to carry on a secret espionage and to bring to trial any one who held views contrary to those of the new code.

Aspirants to the priesthood were obliged to seek their education in France. Death was the penalty visited upon them if they returned. A similar punishment was inflicted on any one who should harbor them or seek their services. All priests were ordered out of England within forty days; and it was death to ordain one. By these, and such measures, was "the glorious Reformation which gave England religious liberty" established. There is nothing in all history, Ireland's penal laws excepted, that can compare in cruelty and infamy with the methods used by Elizabeth in the work of Reformation. Neither

pagan Rome, nor Moslem Turkey, ever resorted to such barbarities. Words fail to describe the process by which the new religion was forced upon the English people. It is only ignorance of history that saves decent Protestants of today the blush of shame when the Reformation is mentioned. How any one can laud it must ever remain a mystery.

In reference to the queen's achievement, I quote the following from Green's *History of the English People*, Vol. II, page 295: "In many churches they had no sermons, not one in seven years, and some not one in twelve. The Protestant preachers were few and hampered by the exaction of licenses. In many cases churches had neither parson, vicar, nor curate, but a sorry reader. Even when the new clergy were of a higher intellectual stamp they were unpopular. Many of those who were set in the place of the displaced clergy roused disgust by their violence and greed. Chapters plundered their own estates by leases and fines and by felling timber. The marriages of the clergy became a scandal, which was increased when the gorgeous vestments of the old worship were cut up into gowns

and bodices for the priests' wives. . . . Only in a few instances, where the more zealous of the reformers had settled was there any religious instruction. 'In many places,' it was reported after ten years of the Queen's rule, 'the people cannot yet say their commandments, and in some not the articles of their belief.' Naturally enough, the bulk of Englishmen were found to be 'utterly devoid of religion' and came to church 'as to a May game.' To modern eyes the Church under Elizabeth would seem little better than a religious chaos."

But in all Elizabeth's monstrous career there is nothing that causes such loathing as her treatment of her guest and cousin, Mary, Queen of Scots. Jealousy, dissimulation, treachery, bigotry, and a hatred such as could exist only in a brutalized woman, entered into that crime. Mary remained the queen through it all, Elizabeth the monster. Mary asked for the services of a priest in her last moments. But even this was refused, as Elizabeth's ministers were sure this would be contrary to God's law and would seriously stain their own souls!

The Protestant historian Guizot says (Vol. II,

page 356, American Edition): "She (Elizabeth) tarnished the brilliancy of her reign and forever sullied her glory by feminine follies and evil passions, while obstinately refusing to accept the duties and enjoy the legitimate happiness of a woman's life. . . . She oppressed the Catholics, and their number, which at her accession perhaps equalled that of the Protestants, rapidly diminished under the measures which she applied to them. Men who can neither practise the rites of their religion, nor quit the kingdom, who cannot leave their homes without authorization, who are incessantly exposed to vexations and acts of injustice, not to mention the terrible risk of an accusation of treason, abandon their faith if they are weak, or take refuge in exile if they are energetic and zealous. Upon this destruction of the liberty of her Catholic subjects Elizabeth firmly established the Anglican Church." So if our Episcopalian friends refuse to accept Henry as the founder of their Church, Guizot submits Elizabeth.

The same author mocks Elizabeth, who, after signing Mary's death-warrant, sheds tears over the tragedy. "She (Elizabeth)," he says,

“feigned great anger, shedding tears, and asserting that she had given no order. The secretary of State, Davison, was sent to the Tower; Burleigh and other ministers were disgraced. Walsingham had been prudent enough to absent himself; when he reappeared, his colleagues were not long in returning to favor. . . . Elizabeth’s first care had been to communicate to King James the grief she experienced at the unhappy event which had occurred without her knowledge in her kingdom. The King wept on learning the death of his mother, asserting he would move heaven and earth in his vengeance. His anger, however, was soon appeased; the pension which he received from Elizabeth was increased; one of the obstacles which might impede his accession to the throne of England had disappeared.” Such was the stuff of which the Reformation in England was made!

I shall not dwell on the work of Reformation under the wretched Stuarts, except to say that its crimes and cruelties did not grow less under the persecuting spirit of puritanism. At the death of Elizabeth in 1603 the new religion might be considered fairly established. But such was

not the case. Faked excuses, such as the "Gunpowder Plot," were sought for further persecution. The bloody business continued through subsequent reigns. Nor did Catholics experience any relief under Cromwell. The story is a long one, full of cruelty, injustice and infamy. Protestantism was forced upon England as the Moslem faith was forced upon oriental peoples centuries before.

The world is beginning to understand better the situation as it was. The "conspiracy against truth," which most English history and much English literature have been, is breaking up in spots; and intelligent, fair-minded people are coming to realize that the "glorious Reformation" needed all the lies that have been written and spoken in its behalf. It was, indeed, the monster crime of all ages.

THE REFORMATION IN IRELAND

The Irish did not take kindly to the Reformation, and, hence, the process was slow and painful. It extended over centuries, repeatedly drenched the country in blood, gave the world a story of unparalleled atrocity, and was finally abandoned as a failure. The effort to bring it about began in 1535, when Thomas Cromwell, the lay vicar general of the Church in England, appointed one, George Brown, an Englishman, an ex-Augustinian monk, a Lutheran, and a married man, to the Archbishopial See of Dublin.

This royal favorite, who is said to have performed the ceremony which united the marrying Henry to Anne Boleyn, was a man of inconsiderable parts, but was a willing tool and a sycophant. His efforts to "convert" the Irish by persuasion were a signal failure. However, with cunning and diplomacy, and working in conjunction with Deputy Grey, he did accomplish something. By corruption and bribery, by intimidation and

promises, and by illegally excluding diocesan proctors from exercising their traditional rights, he was able to secure for Henry the title of "Sole and supreme head on earth of the Church in Ireland" from an Irish parliament. Every official, every public servant, was obliged to take the Oath of Supremacy. A refusal to do so was visited with pains and penalties.

The monasteries were visited with the double purpose of propaganda and spoliation. Dr. D'Alton says: "The Trinitarians of Antherée numbered forty-two. Warned that the King's officers were to visit them, they made their preparations and distributed all their goods to the poor, and when they were summoned to take the Oath of Supremacy (February, 1539) one and all refused. The superior declared on their behalf that 'they recognized no head of the Catholic Church save the Vicar of Christ; and as for the King of England, they regarded him not even as a member of that Church, but as the head of the Synagogue of Satan.' One of the royal officers drew his sword and with a blow cut off the head of the intrepid priest." Through bribery, confiscation and slaughter the work of the

Reformation was carried on under Henry. The monasteries were robbed of their lands and treasures, the monks were sent out penniless into the world. But the "glorious" Reformation made little progress.

Speaking of the work begun by Henry VIII and carried on by his successors, Mrs. J. R. Green, wife of the English historian, says in *The Irish Nationality*, pages 131-2: "At a prodigious price the purging of the soil from the Irish race was begun. Such mitigations as the horrors of war allow were forbidden to these 'rebels' by legal fiction. Torturers and hangmen went out with the soldiers. There was no protection for any soul; the old, the sick, infants, women, scholars; any one of them might be a landholder, or a carrier on of the tradition of the tribal owners, and was in any case a rebel appointed to death. No quarter was allowed, no faith kept, and no truce given. Chiefs were made to 'draw and carry,' to abase them before the tribes. Poets and historians were slaughtered and their books and genealogies burned, so that no man 'might know his own grandfather' and all Irishmen be confounded in the

same ignorance and abasement, all glories gone, and all rights lost. The great object of the government was to destroy the whole tradition, wipe out the Gaelic memories, and begin a new English life.

“ But even with all legal aids to extermination the land war proved more difficult than the English had expected. It lasted for some seventy years. The Irish were inexhaustible in defence, prodigious in courage, and endured hardships that Englishmen could not survive. The most powerful governors that England could supply were sent over, and furnished with English armies and stores. Fleets held the harbors, and across all the seas from Newfoundland to Dantzic gathered in provisions for the soldiers. Armies fed from the seaports chased the Irish through the winter months, when the trees were bare and naked and the kine without milk, killing every living thing and burning every granary of corn, so that famine should slay what the sword had lost. Out of the woods the famished Irish came creeping on their hands, for their legs could not bear them, speaking like ghosts crying out of their graves, if they found a few

water-cresses flocking as to a feast; so that in a short space there were almost none left, and a most populous and plentiful country suddenly left void of man and beast—a place where no voice was heard in ears save woe and fear and grief, a place where there was no pause for consolation nor appearance of joy on face.”

Lecky's *Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. II, page 15, says: “All the paths of honor and wealth were monopolized by Protestants, while shackles of every description hampered the Catholics in all the relations of life. Yet these only clung the closer to their faith on account of the storms that assailed it. That very acute observer, Arthur Young, declared at the close of the penal laws, that the relative proportion of Catholics to Protestants had not been at all reduced—if anything rather the reverse—and that those who denied this admitted that, at the past rate of conversions, 4,000 years would be required to make Ireland Protestant. In the Irish Parliament it was stated that 71 years of the penal system had only produced 4,055 converts.”

During the brief reign of the boy, Edward VI, little was done. The work of despoiling the

monasteries and dispersing the monks was kept up. The Protector, Somerset, it is said, was able to get enough out of the work to erect the great English palace which bears his name.

Elizabeth inaugurated a system of persecution which up to her time had no parallel in Christian annals. The royal supremacy, in matters of religion, became again the law of the realm. The Book of Common Prayer was made the ritual in all places of worship. Bishops and priests were banished or put to death, their places being filled often with ignorant and lascivious men. A priest who celebrated Mass was fined and imprisoned for six months for the first offence; the second brought an indefinite imprisonment; the third was punished with a life sentence. Penalties ever growing in cruelty were inflicted upon the laity. Her deputies made Munster a desert where nothing lived, where even wild animals died of hunger. Fire and sword had destroyed everything, crops, villages, etc. Birds flew from it, for they could find nothing to eat.

The clergy, however, were the chief sufferers. Bishop O'Hely of Mayo, and a Franciscan, Fr.

O'Rourke, were together put on the rack, had their arms and legs broken with hammers, needles thrust under their nails, and were then hanged. Several Franciscan monks were hanged to trees, their own girdles being used as the necessary rope. O'Hurly, Archbishop of Cashel, was first imprisoned, then chained to the trunk of a tree, his boots filled with pitch and oil, etc., which were set on fire. After an hour of this torture, when the flesh had fallen from his limbs, he was again thrown into prison, and finally hanged. All this because he refused to acknowledge Elizabeth as the supreme head of the Church. These, and such as these, were the means by which the "good Queen Bess" brought about the "Godly" work of the Reformation, a work in which she was ably assisted by Loftus, whom she had appointed Archbishop of Dublin.

The International Encyclopædia, in the article on Ireland, says of Elizabeth's work: "In order to destroy Irish resistance the English devastated the villages, crops, and cattle, putting to death all the inhabitants they could secure. The greater part of Munster and Ulster were laid desolate and many more perished from hunger

than by the sword." Before this it says: "The entire Celtic population of Ireland, and the majority of the inhabitants of the Pale, remained Catholic. The Anglican Church thus became a mere instrument in the hands of the English rulers in Dublin Castle."

Macauley, Vol. I, page 72, says: "The English conquerors neglected all legitimate means of conversion. . . . The government contented itself with setting up a vast hierarchy of Protestant archbishops, bishops, and rectors, who did nothing, and who for doing nothing were paid out of the spoils of a Church loved and revered by the great body of the people."

When James I ascended the throne of England, Catholics openly rejoiced, for it was fondly hoped that the son of Mary, Queen of Scots, would be at least tolerant. But the new king was an uncertain quantity, and of weak moral fibre. Under him the Irish were robbed of their lands, and Ulster was planted with English and Scotch adventurers. The Catholic clergy were again ordered to quit the kingdom. James, though baptized a Catholic, was brought up under the influence of Scotch Presbyterianism,

and, while not a persecutor by nature, yielded to the Protestant element that considered toleration of Catholics a crime.

The Britannica, article on Ireland, speaking of James I's time, says: "A proclamation for banishing Romish priests was issued in 1605 and was followed by an active and general persecution. . . . Illegal means were taken to enforce uniformity (on the laity). Privy seals addressed to men of wealth and position commanded their attendance at Church before the deputy or the provincial president, on pain of unlimited fine and imprisonment by the Irish Star Chamber."

James was succeeded by another wretched Stuart, Charles I. He, too, was inclined to be tolerant, but was frightened by the declaration issued by a Protestant bishop, who insisted that "idolatry and superstition must be put down." "Popish rites and ceremonies" were declared unlawful. New confiscations were ordered or allowed. Catholics paid the king a huge tribute for toleration which they did not receive. Charles was always in need of money. His reign was characterized by greed, ineptitude, and vacillation. However, most of the injustice done to

Catholics in his time was prompted by the Ulster "plantation" and by English and Scotch Puritans.

The *Encyclopædia Britannica* says: "The necessities of Charles I induced his ministers to declare that a great part of Connaught should be declared forfeited. . . . On receiving a large grant from the Irish parliament, the king promised certain graces. Having got the money, Charles as usual broke his word, the lord-deputy began a general system of extortion. . . . Twelve bishops (Protestant), headed by the primate Ussher solemnly protested that 'to tolerate popery is a grievous sin.'"

Charles, condemned to death by the Parliamentary party, went to the scaffold in 1649. The "Protector," Cromwell, leader of the Parliamentarians, secured the reins of power. He was a man of "blood and iron," brave and fanatical, a Christian whose ideas of Christianity were in direct contradiction of the teaching of Christ. No oriental conqueror, bending before Allah, could rise to feast on slaughter with half the relish that the Lord Protector manifested. With Bible in one hand, a sword in the other, he

marched with his well-trained troops to the massacre of men, women and children. Believing it was his especial mission to exterminate popery, and knowing that this could be accomplished in Ireland only by the extermination of papists, he went gleefully to his task. With an ability which none of his predecessors in the work of "conversion" by the sword could boast of, he proceeded against Drogheda, of which he made a holocaust. Other cities suffered a similar fate. All land owned by Catholics was confiscated and handed over to Cromwell's soldiers or to the "adventurers" who had loaned him money wherewith to carry on his wars. "To hell or to Connaught" was the sentence, though Connaught had been so devastated in previous troubles that it afforded a home for no one. Any Catholic who appeared to the east of the Shannon was liable to the supreme penalty. The clergy who were not already slaughtered were given twenty-eight days to leave the country. The Catholic religion was now considered dead.

The Encyclopædia Britannica says: "In 1649 Cromwell landed at Dublin, which the Catholics had not been able to take. With his well-disci-

plined army, 10,000 men of the New Model, he stormed Drogheda and put its garrison of 2,000 to the sword. At Wexford there was another slaughter, but without Cromwell's orders. His successors, Ireton and Ludlow, finished the war, and a great part of the best lands of Munster, Leinster, and Ulster was confiscated and divided among the soldiers of the parliamentary army. The Catholic and loyalist landowners were banished to Connaught."

Macaulay, Vol. I, page 126, says: "In a few months Cromwell subjugated Ireland, as Ireland had never been subjugated during the five centuries of slaughter which had elapsed since the landing of the first Norman settlers. . . . He smote the idolators with the edge of the sword, so that great cities were left without inhabitants, drove many thousands to the Continent, and shipped off many thousands to the West Indies."

Guizot's *History of England*, Vol. II, page 347, says: "The English had undertaken to civilize Ireland by destroying its inhabitants as they had undertaken to establish Protestantism by prohibiting the Catholic worship in a country

entirely devoted to that religion. Cromwell boasted of having slain all the friars of Drogheda, and that not more than thirty of the garrison had escaped alive."

A few sentences from Green's history, Vol. II, page 179: "In Ireland the spirit of the Reformation never existed among the people. . . . Cromwell, however, was resolute for a religious uniformity between the two islands. Recalcitrant priests were thrown into prison, images were plucked down from the rood-loft, the most venerable of Irish relics, St. Patrick's staff, was burned in the market place. But he found no support in his vigor save from across the Channel."

Again, on page 278: "Thousands perished by famine or the sword. Shipload after shipload of those who surrendered were sent over sea for sale into forced labor in Jamaica and the West Indies. More than forty thousand of the beaten Catholics were allowed to enlist in foreign service and found a refuge in exile under the banners of France and Spain. . . . Among the bitter memories which part Ireland from England, the memory of the bloodshed and confiscation which

the Puritans wrought remains the bitterest. The Protector's policy was successful in the ends at which it aimed. The whole native population lay helpless and crushed."

Another infamous Stuart, Charles II, came into power in 1660. Like others of his line, he would have refrained from persecution if he were strong enough. But he yielded to pressure from the Puritans. New penalties were imposed upon those who refused to take the Oath of Supremacy, deny transubstantiation, or receive "the sacrament" according to Anglican ritual. Catholics could hold no office, nor live in corporate towns. Priests were banished. The aged Archbishop of Dublin was thrown into prison, where he died. The Archbishop of Armagh, Oliver Plunkett, was hanged and quartered. So the work of "converting" Ireland continued.

James II resolved to do justice to the Catholics, but this resolve cost him his throne. His son-in-law, William of Orange, was invited to enter England with his army. He experienced little resistance there, more in Scotland, but most in Ireland. The battle of the Boyne ended James' hopes, and the cowardly monarch fled

from the field. The Irish, however, still continued to fight the usurper until the Treaty of Limerick which was broken by William's followers "before the ink was dry."

Notwithstanding the fact that the Treaty of Limerick granted Catholics considerable rights, it was only after this famous historic event that persecution began in real earnest. This, however, was the work not so much of the king as of an Irish parliament, a parliament composed of "planters" and one to which Catholics had no access. The Lords and Commons were ably assisted in their work of persecution by a bigoted, ignorant, and greedy clergy, who were taking revenge for their failure to shake the faith of the Irish. In the opinion of Edmund Burke, who was not a Catholic, the new penal code was "as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a feeble people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

If, departing from my custom, I take a quotation from a Catholic author, it is because he gives in short space what may be found at length in

Protestant authors. D'Alton in his article on "Ireland" in the Catholic Encyclopædia, says:

"King William also promised to have the Irish Parliament grant a further relaxation of the penal laws in force. This treaty, however, was soon torn to shreds, and in spite of William's appeals, the Irish Parliament refused to ratify it, and embarked on fresh penal legislation. Under these new laws Catholics were excluded from Parliament, from the bench and the bar, from the army and navy, from all civil offices, from the corporations, and even from the corporate towns. They could not have Catholic schools at home or attend foreign schools, or inherit landed property, or hold land under lease, or act as executors or administrators, or have arms or ammunition, or a horse worth £5. Neither could they bury their dead in Catholic ruins, or make pilgrimages to holy wells, or observe Catholic holidays. They could not intermarry with Protestants, the clergyman assisting at such marriages being liable to death. The wife of a Catholic landlord turning Protestant got separate maintenance; the son turning Protestant got the whole estate; and the Catholic

landlord having only Catholic children was obliged at death to divide his estate among his children in equal shares. All the regular clergy, as well as bishops and vicars-general, should quit the kingdom. The secular clergy might remain, but must be registered, nor could they have on their churches either steeple or bell. This was the Penal Code, elaborated through nearly half a century with patience, and care, and ingenuity, perhaps the most infamous code ever elaborated by civilized man."

Speaking of conditions under William and Mary, Macaulay says, Vol. 12, page 171: "The Irish who remained within the English pale were, one and all, hostile to the English domination. They were therefore subjected to a rigorous system of police, the natural though lamentable effect of extreme danger and extreme provocation. A Papist was not permitted to have a sword or a gun. He was not permitted to go more than three miles out of his parish except to the market town on the market day. Lest he should give information or assistance to his brethren who occupied the western half of the island, he was forbidden to live within ten miles

of the frontier. Lest he should turn his house into a place of resort for malcontents, he was forbidden to sell liquor by retail. One proclamation announced that, if the property of any Protestant should be injured by marauders, his loss should be made good at the expense of his Popish neighbors. Another gave notice that if any Papist who had not been at least three months domiciled in Dublin should be found there, he should be treated as a spy. Not more than five Papists were to assemble in the capital or its neighborhood on any pretext. Without a protection from the government no member of the Church of Rome was safe; and the government would not grant a protection to any member of the Church of Rome who had a son in the Irish army."

Again, on page 210, Macaulay says: "In 1745, indeed, when the Highlanders were marching towards London, the Roman Catholics of Ireland were so quiet that the Lord Lieutenant could, without the smallest risk, send several regiments across St. George's Channel to reinforce the army of the Duke of Cumberland. Nor was this submission the effect of content, but of

mere stupefaction and brokenness of heart. The iron had entered into the soul. The memory of past defeats, the habit of daily enduring insult and oppression, had cowed the spirit of the unhappy nation. There were indeed Irish Roman Catholics of great ability, energy, and ambition: but they were to be found everywhere except in Ireland, at Versailles and at St. Ildefonso, in the armies of Frederic and in the armies of Maria Theresa. One exile became a Marshal of France. Another became Prime Minister of Spain. If he had staid in his native land, he would have been regarded as an inferior by all the ignorant and worthless squireens who had signed the Declaration against Transubstantiation. In his palace at Madrid he had the pleasure of being assiduously courted by the ambassador of George the Second, and of bidding defiance in high terms to the ambassador of George the Third. Scattered over all Europe were to be found brave Irish generals, dexterous Irish diplomatists, Irish counts, Irish barons, Irish Knights of Saint Lewis and of Saint Leopold, of the White Eagle and of the Golden Fleece, who, if they had remained in the house of bondage, could not have been

ensigns of marching regiments or freemen of petty corporations. These men, the natural chiefs of their race, having been withdrawn, what remained was utterly helpless and passive. A rising of the Irishry against the Englishry was no more to be apprehended than a rising of the women and children against the men."

Among the penal laws enacted in the reign of William III were the following:

"All popish archbishops, bishops, vicars-general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friars, and all papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction should depart the kingdom before the first of May, 1698. Those who refused to obey the order were to be imprisoned until they could be transported beyond the seas. If any returned, they would be considered guilty of high treason and executed. Any popish bishop or other clergyman coming from beyond the seas should be imprisoned until he could be transported. Should he return, he is to be executed."

Any person concealing or entertaining any popish bishop or priest should be fined £20 for the first offense, £40 for the second, and for the third should forfeit all his lands and tenements,

all his goods and chattels, one half to the king, the other half to the informer, unless it exceeded £100.

The law of Elizabeth, fining every person for neglecting to attend the reformed church, a shilling for each neglect, was revived.

“If any subjects of Ireland go or send any child or other person to be educated in any popish university or school, or in any private family beyond the seas, or send money for the maintenance of any such person, every such offender shall forever be disabled to bring any action in law or equity, to be guardian or administrator, to receive legacy, deed or gift, besides shall forfeit all their estates, both real and personal during their lives.”

Nine years later, in the reign of Queen Anne, it was enacted:

“If the eldest or any other son became a Protestant, the father could not dispose of his property. If a child become a Protestant, it was taken from the control of the parents and put under the guardianship of the nearest Protestant relative. If children became Protestants, the parents were obliged to disclose their property so that pro-

vision might be made for such children. If a wife became a Protestant, the Lord Chancellor could make such provision for her as he thought proper."

If the children of Protestants became papists, they were disinherited, the property going to the next akin Protestant.

Papists could not purchase lands. They could rent for thirty-one years only. Should the profit on the rented land exceed one-third of the rent, any Protestant who discovered the fact could oust the Catholic and take possession himself.

Papists could not vote at elections, serve on grand juries, could not live in the cities of Limerick or Galway, could not have more than two apprentices, except in the linen trade.

Twenty pounds penalty or two months' imprisonment for not acknowledging when and where mass was celebrated; who and what persons were present; when or where a priest or school-master resided; £50 for discovering an archbishop or vicar-general; £20 for discovering a priest not registered; £10 for a school-master. These rewards to be levied exclusively on papists. Thirty

pounds per annum settled on any priest who became Protestant. Catholics could not purchase any of the confiscated estates.

About penal laws under William and Anne, Hallam in his *Constitutional History of England*, Vol. II, page 593, says: "No papist was allowed to keep a school, or to teach any in private houses, except the children of the family. Severe penalties were denounced against such as should go themselves or send others for education beyond the seas in the Romish religion; and, on probable information given to a magistrate, the burden of proving the contrary was thrown on the accused—the offence not to be tried by jury. . . . Children, in case of either parent being Protestant, might be taken from the other. . . . No papist could be guardian to any child. The eldest son, being a Protestant," might secure for himself his father's estate. "Papists were disabled from purchasing lands except for terms of not more than thirty-one years. . . ." If the heir to an estate did not conform in six months, the property was forfeited to the nearest Protestant heir. Then he says, "To have exterminated the catholics by the

sword, or expelled them, would have been little more repugnant to justice and humanity."

Under Queen Anne, who reigned in the early years of the eighteenth century, matters grew worse. Any one informing about the clergy received, for bishops, £50; for priests, £20; school-masters, £10; the amount, which was a goodly sum in those days, was levied upon the Catholics of the district in which the offending clergyman was found. "The priest-hunters" came into being at this time. I quote a characteristic letter or two from these gentry. The letters, now state papers, exist in great number.

"To their Excellencies the Lords Justices of Ireland.

The humble petition of Samuel Munsell High Sheriff of the County of Limerick.

Sheweth—That your Petitioner brought up to this City three convict priests and one felon who were under rule of Transportation, in order to be transported.

That your Petitioner delivered three of the said persons to the Court of King's Bench the other being a priest and not able to come upp was

left behind being above eighty years of age which appeareth by severall affidavits.

That your Petitioner was at great charge at having horses for the said persons to ride on and severall Protestants to guard them being apprehensive of their being rescued, there being severall Popish Tories out in Arms in the severall counties through which they were to pass.

May it please your Excellencies to grant such reward etc.”

“The humble petition of William Montgomery etc.

Sheweth—That at the Assizes for the County of Antrim held on the 28th day of March 1716, John McDonald a popish priest not registered was tried and found guilty for exercising the function of a popish priest and not being registered, at your Petitioner’s prosecution.

That your Petitioner was at great trouble and expense in apprehending and prosecuting the said McDonald.

He therefore prays for a grant of the reward set forth in the proclamation.”

The same spirit of persecution continued under the House of Brunswick.

In this manner the work of Reformation was conducted in Ireland. It continued through centuries and is stained with every form of crime. It, indeed, presents a long and shameful chapter in the history of the human family. Neither the Roman emperors, in their desire to crush Christianity, nor the blood-thirsty Moslems, in their career of conquest, can show anything like it. As a prolonged work of savagery and infamy, it stands alone in the dread story of man's inhumanity.

THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND

Scotland was Protestanized thoroughly in the brief period of fourteen years. Of course, Catholic convictions still remained. But externally and officially, from the first grand act of revolt, the assassination of the cardinal archbishop of St. Andrew's, to the law utterly suppressing Catholic worship in the realm, but a few years elapsed. The work of reformation was briefer and more complete in Scotland than in any other country.

The causes for this success were many, some of them such as existed elsewhere, some special to the country.

It seems religion was at a low ebb in Scotland at the time of the Reformation. The Church, being rich and powerful, attracted ambitious men who had little interest in the supernatural. Royalty too often interfered in the affairs of the Church. The bastard son of James V was prior of an important monastery. The wealth of some of these religious houses excited the cupidity of

the nobles. The people were neglected and without proper religious training.

Then, at the time when John Knox began to thunder his denunciations, the Reformation had made considerable progress in other countries. Luther had broken with Rome almost thirty years; Henry VIII and John Calvin about a dozen years previously. Europe was then quite familiar with the new teaching which had been brought to Scotland, even before Knox took it up.

The political situation was also favorable. James V died in 1542, leaving only one legitimate child, an infant, afterwards known as Mary, Queen of Scots. The world of that day did not take kindly to women rulers. Knox wrote violently against what he called "The Monstrous Regiment (rule) of women." In this situation Scotland seemed the legitimate game of royal intriguers. Henry VIII had his paid agents in the northern kingdom constantly. France, too, speculated upon the possibilities. To which nation would Scotland lean? Mary solved the question later, so far as she could, by marrying a Frenchman. This step was quite unpopular, and was a signal for many intrigues. Mary was

totally unfit to handle the situation. She had, in spite of many virtues, much of the weakness and vacillation of the Stuarts. Plot succeeded plot, while Henry VIII, and after him Elizabeth, stood ready to take advantage of any situation.

So with Europe all ablaze with the new religious revolution, with many schemers, as unscrupulous as the worst, without a strong hand at the helm, Scotland became the prize of the man or woman who could seize it. Every influence opposed to France turned to England and Protestantism. All that was now necessary was a man who would identify religion with the political tendency and arouse the multitude against that one strong organization that held out for Mary and against England, the Catholic Church. The man, after some minor experiments, was found in the ex-priest, John Knox.

Knox was a remarkable man. Little is known of his early life; even the year of his birth is uncertain. The event occurred between 1505 and 1515. He was therefore about Calvin's age. He was a priest. He, himself, says that he had been "one of Baal's shaven sort." We have other

evidence that, besides being a notary public, he exercised the sacred ministry in his native diocese of St. Andrew's.

He was a man, not of special scholarship, but of considerable natural ability, great fearlessness, and eloquence of the most impassioned type. His knowledge of the Scotch vernacular was excellent, and served well in the wild denunciations of the Church. Some of the descriptions we have of his manner in preaching are striking. In his later years, though he often climbed to the pulpit with difficulty, he would, after a while, become animated and violent as if bent on smashing everything within his reach.

Of all the reformers, Knox is perhaps the most unlovable. Like his master, John Calvin, he was a dyspeptic, and, like him, his theology, as well as his temper, showed marked traces of the malady. Knox hated joy in any form; hated music in churches; hated his lawful queen, almost as much because she was joyous as because she was a Catholic. As love is the dominant note in the religion of Christ, hatred is the inspiration of Knox's theology. Death and damnation to every one who differed from him. He would slaugh-

ter pagans, heretics, and Catholics as a sacred duty.

Yet, Knox did not contribute anything to the Reformation. His theology was taken almost wholly from John Calvin. In fact, all the Protestant theology of the time was either Lutheranism or Calvinism, or some strange admixture of both. The Anabaptists contributed something new, but they were everywhere persecuted. Even Knox regarded them as "blasphemous cavilers."

The Scotch Reformation began in violence and blood in 1546. George Wishart, who had imbibed the new views in Germany, began preaching them near the Knox home. He was also accused of entering into a conspiracy with the English interests for the purpose of carrying off Cardinal Beaton. He was tried, found guilty, and, according to the cruel custom of the time, burned at the stake. In retaliation for this the Protestant party assassinated the cardinal, took possession of the Castle of St. Andrew's, where they were joined by Knox, who joyfully approved of what was done. The rebels were defeated, and Knox, with other companions, was

taken prisoner and for nineteen months became a galley-slave of France. It was during this period that he contracted the dyspepsia which had such an influence upon his career and his theology.

When his captivity came to an end, Knox returned to England, where Protestantism was in the ascendent under the boy-king, Edward VI. He became a prominent figure, was proffered a bishopric, which he declined, and had the satisfaction of aiding in the development of Reformation theology. When Mary came to the throne of England, Knox went to the Continent and there imbibed still more the spirit of Calvin. His preaching and politics got him into much trouble there.

In 1555 Knox returned to Scotland, where Mary of Guise was regent, Mary, Queen of Scots, being yet but a girl. His stay in Geneva had taught him Calvin's method of swaying the secular arm for his theological purposes. He now felt the time had come for openly denouncing Catholic doctrine and practice. Catholics in attending mass were as much idolaters as the Jews who sacrificed their children to Moloch.

It was the duty of the State to exterminate them, and if the State failed to attend to the matter, the duty devolved on individual believers. Such were Knox's views.

In 1556 he returned to Geneva to escape prosecution. But he kept up a correspondence with his party in Scotland, wrote a good deal, repeatedly insisted on the duty of exterminating Catholics, and made himself still further familiar with Calvinistic theology and church polity. These he would introduce into Scotland in due time.

On Elizabeth's coming to the throne of England in 1558, Knox returned to his native land. He began to preach, and so violent were his diatribes against the queen regent, and against Catholics in general, that his followers rushed upon churches and monasteries, which they sacked and ruined. The work of devastation was carried from city to city, the mob, possessed of his own spirit of hatred, stopping at nothing. The work, however, aroused considerable opposition, and the Protestant party, fearing for their cause, sought the aid of England. Elizabeth never forgave Knox for his attack on the "Monstrous

Regiment of Women," but still she sent him men and money. The Protestant party assembled a parliament which did Knox's bidding in every particular. This assembly, though unconstitutional, outlawed the Catholic religion, made attendance at mass a crime punishable by death for the third offense, and gave the new confession of faith as the religion of Scotland. Doctrine and discipline were thoroughly Calvinistic. Every contrary teaching must be suppressed and the old faith banished from the land.

In the following year Mary, who had lived in France as wife of the French king, found herself a widow. She returned to Scotland. Without attempting to interfere with the new religion, now established, she simply sought to have mass in her own private chapel. This created a very difficult situation: the lawful queen asking for what was forbidden within the realm, and punished by fines and imprisonments, and, for the third offense, by death. The queen's half-brother, Lord James Stewart, though a Protestant, was powerful enough to secure for her the privilege. Knox thundered against the concession and declared "one mass more fearful to him

than 10,000 armed men." He denounced without ceasing the queen, whom he called "Jezebel," and her religion, which was to him the religion of Antichrist. His most ardent supporters, chagrined at his violent denunciation of the queen, remonstrated with him, even threatened him, but they failed utterly to restrain him. About this time he amused Scotland not a little by marrying a girl of sixteen, while he himself was well in the fifties. This was the apostate priest's second marriage. His former wife, however, died some time before. His hatred of Mary, his fear of her success, as well as the violence of his harangues, brought on a stroke of apoplexy. But he recovered sufficiently to preach again. He did not, however, live to be old; and his last years, like those of the other reformers, were unhappy. When his power began to wane, his followers began to abandon him. While the monasteries were being despoiled, hungry lords clung to the one who denounced them and clamored for their suppression. But now, when these men found themselves secure in the possession of the spoils, they were not so interested in the leader. Besides, his violence, his lack of all the

decencies of life, his brutally offensive preaching, gradually alienated men from him.

Lest I may be accused of being severe on Knox and his party, I shall quote from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*'s article on Scotland: "On the 24th of August (1560) three statutes abolished papal and prelatical authority and jurisdiction; repealed the old laws in favor of the Church, and punished celebrants and attendants of the mass—for the first offence by confiscation, for the second by exile, for the third by death. . . . The *Book of Discipline* and the *Book of Order* express Knox's ideals, which, as far as they are noble, as in the matter of education, and of provision for the poor, remained, in part or in whole, 'devout imaginations.' Not so the Knoxian claims for the power of the ministers to excommunicate, with civil penalties, and generally to rule the roost in secular matters. The nobles and gentry clung to the wealth of the old church. . . . Neglect as well as mob violence left the ecclesiastical buildings in a ruinous condition, but the authority of the preachers with their power of boycotting (excommunication) became a theocracy.

“The supernatural claims of these pulpiteers to dominance in matters public or private were the main cause of a century of war and tumult. In the hands of the ministers a Calvinism more Calvinistic than Calvin’s was the bitter foe of freedom of life, of conscience, and of religious tolerance. . . .” Again: “This was the beginning of the sorrows of more than a century. The Kirk Presbyterian was founded on the Genevan model, and was intended to be a theocracy. She claimed the power of the keys, the power of excommunicating even the king, a sentence practically equivalent to outlawry. These pretensions were incompatible with the freedom of state and of individuals.”

From Hallam’s *Constitutional History of England*, Vol. I, page 147: “‘One Mass,’ Knox declared, in preaching against Mary’s private chapel, ‘was more fearful unto him than if 10,000 enemies landed in any part of the realm on purpose to suppress the whole religion.’ . . . In a conversation with Maitland he asserted most explicitly the duty of putting idolaters to death. Nothing can be more sanguinary than the reformer’s spirit in this remarkable interview. . . .

It is strange to see men professing all the while our modern creed of charity and toleration, extol these sanguinary spirits of the 16th Century."

After Knox, the only commanding figure in Scotch Reformation times was the unhappy Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, who stood out for the old faith. The character of this woman is hard to understand. She combined deplorable weaknesses with virtues of the highest order. One of her marriages was a scandal, while in moments of great trial she displayed a courage and magnanimity never surpassed. Her manner of meeting death was truly marvelous. In this she rose above all her enemies.

In extenuation of her weaknesses it must be said that the situation in which she found herself was exceedingly difficult. Elizabeth, always jealous of the fascination of Mary's face and manner, hating her, too, as a rival to the throne of England, was ever willing to assist her enemies. Mary's residence in France from the age of six until after the death of her husband, prevented her securing any practical knowledge of her native land. Returning thereto a young widow of less than twenty summers, in 1561,

she depended wholly upon such advisers as she could pick.

The religion of the country had been changed the year previous. To such lengths did the reformers go that, as already said, she with difficulty was permitted to practice her faith in her own private chapel. Knox railed at her with brutal violence. To whom would this young, inexperienced woman turn? Her impulse naturally was to lean on those who could secure her confidence. This was her fatal weakness, as it was the cause of most of her troubles, and the questions that have arisen about her behavior.

It would seem that Scotland of that day had scarcely one reputable man in public life. The history of the period is puzzling in its sordidness. Corruption, intrigue, assassination, were everywhere the order of the day. Take up any authority on the period and you will be amazed at the wretched story unfolded. In the other countries, England, Ireland, Germany, Switzerland, though the work of reformation marched in pillage and bloodshed, yet the situation was relieved by the heroic deeds, the self-sacrificing devotion of some few who clung to the old order.

But in Scotland you search in vain for anything of the sort. Virtue seemed to have abandoned the kingdom. It is asserted that some merit still existed in the Highlands. But these did not figure in the politics of the time, nor in the kaleidoscope of infamy and crime that marked the change of religion in Scotland.

The new preachers, who took the place of the deposed clergy, were much after the model their master, John Knox, gave. They were well informed, indulged in fiery eloquence, but they were openly simoniacal. Hallam, as well as other historians, says they received their appointments on promise of turning over the greater part of the church revenues to their patrons. So the confiscated wealth of old monasteries and churches went to the barons and lairds temporally in control. Such was the Reformation in Scotland; a Reformation whose doctrines and discipline were carried bodily from Geneva. Its sternness, its gloom, its relentlessness, its hatreds, grew more intense under Knox.

Under its influence the wretched James I of England, son of Mary, Queen of Scots, was brought up. He was a weakling in body, and,

in some measure, a weakling also in mind. In his reign, and through his influence, Calvinism was brought into Ireland, in the plantation of Ulster. The difficulties presented by the Irish situation today spring from this. The religious hatreds, so unintelligible to Christian men, are the heritage which John Knox, following his master, Calvin, has left to the world.

About James I, the Britannica article, *Scotland*, has this to say:

“No longer needing Catholic assistance, James threw over his mother, with whom he had been intriguing, and sent the beautiful master of Gray to betray Mary’s secrets to Elizabeth. . . . James practically did nothing to rescue his mother: one of his representatives in England was that Archibald Douglas, who helped to slay his father.

“The execution of Mary on 8th of Feb. left James a free king as far as his mother’s claim to the throne was concerned, and he had his pension of £3,000 or £4,000 from Elizabeth. . . . Thenceforth, till James came to the throne of England, the history of Scotland was but a series of inchoate revolutions, intrigues that led to

nothing definite, and skirmishes in the war of Kirk and State."

That the Reformation in Scotland secured such a triumph in a short time is due, as already stated, to a number of causes. The Church must have been in a deplorable condition, since it furnished no champion of first or second rank. Wealth and servitude to the powers that were, brought about its decrepitude. Its lands and revenues excited the cupidity of princes, nobles, and lairds. The English influence under these two very able and very unscrupulous monarchs, Henry VIII and Elizabeth, acting through agents generously supplied with funds, and residing constantly in Scotland, aided every movement in the interest of the Protestant cause. Fear of France and of Spain, both of which were Catholic, prompted still greater efforts on the part of England and the Protestant party in Scotland. It was a political game more than a religious one.

The power of royalty had suffered serious diminution during the long minority of James V, father of Mary, Queen of Scots, who ascended the throne on the death of his father, though but

a year old. The factions contending for supremacy grew strong and aggressive during this time. James died a few days after the birth of his daughter. So there was a second long minority with Mary of Lorraine, or of Guise, as regent. This French lady was never popular with the Scotch, who openly defied her authority. Factionism continued its progress. There was no political health in the distracted kingdom. Mary, Queen of Scots, daughter of a French mother, wife of a French king, suffered from the hatred of everything French. Catholicism, identified with France, with Mary of Guise, was hated too. Elizabeth, upon whom it had put the stigma of illegitimacy, fought it with tigress resolution. So the old Church, detested for the friends it had made, envied because of its wealth and power, without a capable defender, went down as if built on sand. That fiercest, most unloving and most unlovable form of sectarianism, came to take its place. Scotland, at the bidding of John Knox, cast off the old faith, assassinated its bishops, sacked and pillaged its monasteries, desecrated its churches. It also handed over its legitimate queen to Elizabeth and to the block.

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE

The conditions that made the Reformation possible in other countries prepared the way for its introduction into France. It was not to be expected that with Luther's doctrines spreading over Europe, and Geneva so near, the new theological views could be long kept out. They soon, indeed, secured considerable foothold, and through powerful patrons spread even to the highest classes. Very early in the struggle they were taken under the protection of the king's sister, Margaret of Navarre.

The situation in France differed from that of other countries in this, that, by reason of the Gallican Liberties, the king practically managed the affairs of the Church, as he did the affairs of State. Francis I, who could favor the Reformation in other countries for political reasons, was decidedly opposed to its entrance into his own kingdom, and immediately resorted to repressive measures. This brought opposition and retaliation. Appeals were made for aid

from abroad. The struggle in France assumed in time the proportions of a European question, and was marked on both sides by conspiracy, assassination, massacre. The Huguenots, as the French Protestants were called, suffered severely. Yet they continued to grow in numbers, and, being of the Calvinistic school, they busied themselves in the affairs of State.

When, in 1559, they became so strong that their influence was felt everywhere, Francis II resorted to extreme measures. Plots and counter-plots followed, and the fortunes of the sect varied. Peace seemed to have abandoned the commonwealth. So desperate became the struggle, that the Protestant leaders, Condé and Coligny, ceded the city of Havre to Queen Elizabeth as compensation for the aid she promised.

Charles IX, instigated by the queen-mother, Catherine de Medici, brought about the infamous massacre of St. Bartholomew, in which some thousands of Huguenots were slaughtered. The royal scoundrel had the hardihood to say to the courts of Europe and to the pope, that what happened was done in defense of his life. The fourth war followed this crime. After this

came more severe enactments, which threw the unfortunate Huguenots into a condition of utter hostility. Better conditions soon prevailed.

The Edict of Nantes, 1598, gave the Huguenots large liberties, but did not bring permanent peace.

Even when wars had ceased, bitter feelings between Catholics and Huguenots were too often in evidence. A new conflict broke out between the king and the sectaries in 1616. Later, England sent a fleet of ninety ships to aid the Huguenots. But Richelieu was then prime minister, and under him complete victory was secured for the king. The Edict of Nantes was reaffirmed in 1629, when the wars which had distracted the country for more than seventy years came to an end.

Controversy now took the place of armed conflict. The Huguenots were men of ability, but the Catholic side found defenders imbued with the spirit of the Council of Trent, and more than a match for their adversaries.

Under Louis XIV the liberties granted the Huguenots by the Edict of Nantes began to be restricted. In 1660, though the sect numbered

almost a million and a quarter, it was forbidden to hold national synods. In 1685 the revocation of the Edict of Nantes practically outlawed Protestants. The king at this time gave effect in France to the Lutheran principle, *cujus regio ejus religio*, the temporal ruler dictates the religion of his subjects. This foolish measure necessarily failed to accomplish its purpose. Many emigrated, and many more remained to give trouble.

Napoleon restored to the Huguenots their liberties in the first years of the nineteenth century. Their number was then about 430,000. Later some of them fell under the influence of Wesley, and division entered their ranks. In these latter years France has had about 650,000 Protestants, of whom over one-half million are Reformed, or Huguenots, 80,000 Lutherans, and 10,000 Independents. They have figured very prominently in all political movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Indeed, it is asserted that their influence is out of all proportion to their numbers.

THE REFORMATION IN DENMARK

Denmark, which has much in common with Norway and Sweden, has also this, that its population, with the exception of one or two per cent, belongs to the Evangelical Lutheran Church, which is the State Church. There are, of course, sects in all three nations, and rationalism has made much progress among the Scandinavians, as among other Germanic peoples. But officially, Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, are almost universally Lutherans.

In 1520 Christian II brought two noted Lutheran evangelists, Reinhard and Karlstadt, to preach in Copenhagen. Their success, however, was not great. Frederick I, in 1526, made public proclamation of his own adhesion to Lutheranism, and began the work of "converting" Denmark. His son and successor, Christian III, took up the "godly" task and carried it out by the most drastic methods. He imprisoned all the bishops, confiscated all Church properties, disbanded the monasteries, and forced monks and nuns to listen to Lutheran preachers.

In no country were so dishonest methods applied. The old methods of conducting public services were maintained. Vestments were used, something resembling the mass was performed, altars, candles, everything calculated to deceive the people and make them think that no change had taken place.

The Diet of Copenhagen, in 1544, completed the work of Reformation. The Church's property was all seized, and its rights taken from it. Catholics could no longer hold office; Catholic priests had to quit the country under penalty of death. Persons who would harbor them were subjected to a like penalty. Practically the law demanded either apostasy, exile, or death.

The Britannica says: "The Recess of 1536 enacted that the bishops should forfeit their temporal and spiritual authority, and that all their property should be transferred to the crown for the good of the commonwealth. In the following year a Church ordinance, based upon the canons of Luther, Melanchthon, and Bugenhagen, was drawn up, submitted to Luther for his approval, and promulgated on the 2nd of September, 1537. On the same day seven 'super-

intendents,' including Tausen and Sadolin, all of whom had worked zealously for the cause of the Reformation, were consecrated in place of the dethroned bishops."

In no country, then, did the reformers depart from their usual methods—violence, confiscation, imprisonment, exile, slaughter. In Denmark they added a very decided camouflage.

THE REFORMATION IN NORWAY

The reform movement achieved remarkable success in the smaller of the Scandinavian realms. Norway, like Sweden, is, at least officially, overwhelmingly of the State Lutheran Church, the dissenters being less than three per cent. Yet, the work of Reformation proceeded very slowly in Norway.

The king, Christian II, began in 1519 to take a hand in the right royal game of appropriating Church property. This was done here, as in other countries, to "purify" the Church. Bishops were imprisoned, banished, or executed. Attacks upon the Church and its ceremonies were as violent here as in Scotland. The king and his favorites became rich on the spoils taken from suppressed monasteries and convents. Yet, in spite of violence, spoliation, and deception, it took about a hundred years to "reform" Norway.

Soon the kingdom fell upon evil days. The Britannica says: "After the downfall of Christian II (1513-1524) the position of Norway in

relation to Denmark was changed for the worse. She was ruled for a century and a quarter by Danish officials; the churches and monasteries of Norway were sacked by Danes, and Danes were installed as pastors under the Lutheran system which the Norwegians were compelled to accept in 1539."

REFORMATION IN SWEDEN

In no other country was the Reformation so successful. So thorough-going was it that Sweden's present population of between five and six millions belongs almost exclusively to the Lutheran or State Church, at whose head is the king. Sweden borrowed its religion from Wittenberg; hence added nothing to the innovations of the sixteenth century.

The introduction of the new religion was, in so far as it was not political, a game of plunder. The Church was an estate of the realm and had become very rich. The king and the nobility cast avaricious eyes upon the properties of the monasteries. And unfortunately, as usually happens when the Church is wealthy, its defenders were weak.

The new religion had already secured a sure footing in Europe. Kings had obtained jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical. Impoverished nobles had grown rich on the spoils of sacrilege. Emissaries from Wittenberg came to spread the

gospel of "faith alone," which dispensed with any and all need of restraint.

The Britannica thus describes the first step in the reforming movement: "He (Gustavus I) publicly protested, in the sharpest language, that unless Johannes Magni were recognized at Rome as archbishop of Upsala, he was determined of his own royal authority henceforth to order the affairs of the Church in his realm to the glory of God and the satisfaction of all Christian men. . . . Simultaneously a systematic attack was made upon all religious houses, beginning with the sequestration of the monastery of Gripsholm in January, 1526. . . . On the 18th of February, 1527, two bishops, the first martyrs of Catholicism in Sweden, were gibbeted at Stockholm after a trial which was a parody of justice." See Britannica, article, Sweden.

The reader will recognize in this the well-known methods of the reformers—suppression, spoliation, murder.

But the work of "reforming" Sweden did not proceed peacefully. There was considerable opposition. And the king, after breaking with Rome, thought it prudent to let public devotions

continue as of old. The mass, veneration of the saints, vestments, etc., were permitted for a while; though the business of driving out monks and nuns, slaughtering those who showed opposition, and appropriating properties, continued. So successful was the king in helping himself to the spoils, that he died the richest monarch in Europe, was a multi-millionaire in money, and owned 5,000 goodly farms. He found "reforming" the Church a profitable industry.

Gustavus' son, John III, inclined towards Catholicism, but accomplished nothing of a permanent nature. His brother, Charles, who succeeded him, made the "unchanged Augsburg Confession" the State religion, and enforced it by pains and penalties. Fines, banishment, death, were the methods used to bring about conformity. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* says: "At the Riksdag of the same year (1604), the estates committed themselves irrevocably to Protestantism by excluding Catholics from accession to the throne, and prohibiting them from holding any office or dignity in Sweden. Henceforth, too, every recusant was to be deprived of his estates and banished from the realm."

So the "godly" work was carried on in Sweden by such methods as made the Reformation a success in Germany, Switzerland, England, Scotland. Finland and Iceland were "reformed" in precisely the same way.

REFORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS

The Reformation came to the Netherlands from both Wittenberg and Geneva, though the latter brand ultimately triumphed. The movement began later, developed more slowly, and was less successful here than in the Scandinavian countries. Nor was its progress marked with the spoliation and confiscation, as in other lands.

The reason of the difference was that the Netherlands in Reformation times were composed of seventeen separate provinces ruled by the king of Spain, Charles V, under whom they had become prosperous. Unfortunately, he was succeeded by one who was neither as wise nor as just, his son, Philip II. This event occurred in 1555, a time when the Reformation had made much progress in other countries. As Spain was Catholic, its cause gradually became identified in public esteem with that of the old Church, while Protestantism appealed to the national spirit.

Internecine war began and continued for many years. Outrages and cruelties were perpetrated on both sides. While Catholics suffered from many outrages, they deplored the stern course of Philip's representatives. The Prince of Orange was leader of the Protestant party. At this time began the series of wars in which the armies of other nations participated, and which have caused Belgium to be called "The Cock-pit of Europe."

The upshot of the whole trouble was the combining of seven provinces into the Dutch Republic of Holland, and their separation from the other provinces which constitute the present kingdom of Belgium. These latter provinces permitted freedom of conscience and of worship; Holland outlawed Catholicism.

But the Dutch Republic's religious course did not run smoothly. One Jacobus Arminius, a Protestant professor at the University of Leyden, attacked, with great power, the Calvinistic teachings of the Dutch Reformed Church. He and his followers refused to accept the awful doctrine of predestination as propounded at Geneva and received in Holland. The Arminian

“heresy” was condemned at the famous Calvinistic Synod of Dort. But while Calvinism triumphed in that assembly, its teachings have been less confident since. Outlawed Arminianism has leavened much of the entire mass.

TO THE GENERAL READER

Granting that a Reformation was necessary, and that the time had come when God in His mercy had purposed to remove abuses and bring His Church back to its pristine fervor, think you He would have chosen for the work the men and women that we have been considering in these discourses? Call them up one by one, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Henry VIII, Elizabeth, Knox. Examine their lives even as recorded by their friends and admirers. Which one of them would you trust? Which one would you accept as a leader? If teaching, in order to be effective, must be sustained by example, where is the example? Is it not true that they were all utterly lacking in the most important of the Christian virtues, humility, self-restraint, charity? Some were grossly sensual, some so extravagant in their hatreds as to be unworthy of the name of Christian. You may have been brought up in such strong prejudice against the Catholic Church that you are

disposed to look kindly to anyone who attacks it. In this you are not doing yourself justice. See things as they are, as impartial—and even partial—history discloses them to be. Give the Reformers all the credit they can justly claim, and yet what are they? Compare them with ecclesiastics of the Apostolic age, or with those who came after; compare them with the men who arose to heal the wounds of the Church in the very century of the Reformation; with Ignatius, Xavier, Charles Borromeo, Philip Neri, and a host of others. What a picture and what a contrast!

But even were the Reformers all they should have been, their very doctrines would make reformation impossible. Tell a man, as Luther did, that he is himself the sole judge of what is the law of God, destroy all authority—do you think you can reform him? Further, insist, as Luther insisted, that there is no free will, that we are all under impelling necessity, and that we are bad trees that can bring forth nothing but bad fruit, and you make all attempts at reforming one's self or others ridiculous and vicious.

Or, suppose you lean to Calvinism. Now you are face to face with an eternal and irrevocable decree by which God has chosen some for everlasting happiness and has doomed others to everlasting torments. This has happened without merit on the part of one or demerit on the part of the other. Nothing that either can do will change the decree. If you are destined to heaven, to heaven you must go, and no amount of crime can deprive you of it. If you are doomed to hell, no striving, no praying, no sacrifice, no penance, can avail. Is this doctrine going to bring about reformation? The truth is, it is worse than Luther's, and leaves you helpless under the heel of fate. Hence, I conclude that if the Reformers were bad—and there was not a single good one among them—their teaching is immeasurably worse. It destroys all effort, makes striving impossible, absurd, and even sinful. Worse than this, Calvin, by damning you forever for what you can not help, makes God a cruel tyrant, cruel beyond the power of created mind to conceive. If this estimate of the men and their teaching errs, I would thank the person who will point

out to me wherein it errs. The wonder, then, is not that Protestantism, as a religion, is dying out, but that it ever should have lived."

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

This is the name given to the movement inaugurated within the Church for the purpose of recovering what had been lost in the upheaval, and of preventing a recurrence of the catastrophe. It aimed, first of all, at correcting the abuses pointed out in my discourse on the *Causes of the Reformation*, and at bringing church discipline up to the required standard. The work was taken up by the Council of Trent which sat in 1545, and, after two interruptions, closed its sessions eighteen years later. This council dealt fully with the questions raised by the reformers, answered their objections against Catholic teaching, gave a clear statement of Catholic dogma on all disputed points, and established such discipline as the requirements of the times demanded. It insisted upon due instruction for the laity and the establishment of ecclesiastical seminaries for the training of those who would serve the altar. It thus outlined the work and prepared the way for those remarkable men

whom God raised for the defense of the Church and the healing of its wounds.

Of the work the *Encyclopædia Britannica* article, *Roman Catholic Church*, has this to say: "The seminary system came into being—that is the custom of obliging candidates for ordination to spend several years in a theological college whence lay influences were carefully excluded. But ecclesiastical learning of a wider type was also promoted. Gregory XIII and Sixtus V dreamed of making Rome once more the capital of European culture. Gregory reformed the calendar and founded the university that bears his name. Five years of power were enough for Sixtus to reform the central government of the Church, and the administration of the papal states, to set on foot the Vatican press and to issue an official edition of the Vulgate. Their efforts bore fruit in many quarters. In Rome arose Cardinal Baronius, first of modern Church historians; Spain produced Suarez, most philosophical of divines," etc.

I take the following from the *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, Chapter XVIII: "The necessity of reform and of spiritual regen-

eration of Catholicism had been acknowledged again and again at the opening of the sixteenth century by men of high position in the Church. Time after time it was admitted by the Sacred College, and at each Conclave the whole body of the Cardinals pledged themselves to reform."

From these opening words of the chapter, I pass to page 685: "The decrees on reformation successfully removed the worst abuses which had brought the Church and the clergy into contempt. The authority of the bishops over the clergy, both secular and regular, was considerably strengthened; and means were provided for the removal of evil livers and the incompetent. The parochial clergy were compelled to preach; and the whole discipline of the Church was improved."

Again, page 688: "The Jesuits were the equal in learning of their adversaries and their educational system was immeasurably superior. Protestantism in Germany was torn asunder by petty feuds; and by sheer force of superior ability and unremitting labor Catholicism was restored, first in the Rhine lands and then on the Danube.

The story of this work, the success of which drove Protestantism to desperation and assisted to provoke the Thirty Years War, is beyond our scope. It is sufficient to notice here that it was the fruit of that new Catholicism which emerged triumphant from the Council of Trent. Saintliness of life and the beauty of holiness were again exhibited to the world in a Carlo Borromeo and a Filippo Neri; while Protestantism was too often sinking into a time serving Erastianism or developing an arid scholasticism of its own which quenched the springs of religious life."

Macauley, speaking of the time of the Counter-Reformation, in the second paragraph of his essay upon Von Ranke's History, says: "How it was that Protestantism did so much, yet did not do more, how it was that the Church of Rome, having lost a large part of Europe, not only ceased to lose but actually regained nearly half of what she had lost, is certainly a most curious and important question."

But in this matter it is scarcely necessary to cite authorities. The work of the Counter-Reformation still remains. The canons and decrees of the Council of Trent are open to all. The

seminaries it established are still in existence and doing marvelous work. So anxious was the Church about these ecclesiastical schools, that, when their erection was prohibited by law, as in the British Isles, provision was made abroad for the education of those who aspired to the priesthood.

It also belongs to knowledge within the reach of everyone that the renewed spirit of the time manifested itself in the wonderful societies that then arose to do the work of the Church, and bring back those who had strayed away. While the reformers were still doing battle against established institutions, the great Society of Jesus came into being. This wonderful organization gave to the cause scholars, saints, and missionaries of the highest type, an Ignatius, a Canisius, a Francis Xavier, and a multitude of others. To the three vows common to religious they added a fourth, which obliged them to go wherever the Holy Father might send them. The story of Francis Xavier alone would fill volumes.

The Capuchins also arose at this time. Their especial mission was the care of souls, more particularly hardened sinners, to whom the utter

austerity of these holy men's lives made strong appeal. The Theatines came to improve the morale of the clergy, to visit the sick, to comfort and convert those in prison, especially such as were condemned to capital punishment. The Somaschans, also of Italian origin, banded themselves together for the instruction of children, the care of orphans and of rural districts. The Barnabites devoted themselves to Christian missions, the instruction of youth, and the training of the clergy. The Oblates, established by St. Charles Borromeo, placed themselves at the call of the bishops for the performance of any work that might be assigned them.

The Oratorians of St. Philip Neri, the Congregation to which Cardinal Newman attached himself, became distinguished early not only because of their founder but because of the scholars they gave the Church. This was also the age of St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, and the Discalced Carmelites; also of St. Francis de Sales and Frances de Chantal. All these societies and congregations, all these holy men and women, belonged to the sixteenth century, the century of the Reformation, and sprang from the spirit of

the Counter-Reformation. The brothers of the Christian schools, the Priests of the Mission, and a number of others came afterwards. The ambition of all, or almost all, was to come out of the cloister, mingle with the world, and lead it back to sanity and to God.

The work of reorganizing Europe, of gathering its scattered forces, of saving those who wavered, and of bringing back some, at least, of those who had strayed, might not unreasonably be considered enough for the sadly wounded Church in Europe. This, however, did not suffice to satisfy the new missionary zeal, born of the Counter-Reformation. Francis Xavier, and after him many Jesuits, sailed for India, Japan, and China. The work they accomplished was truly marvelous, indeed, so marvelous that one is reminded of the Apostolic labors of St. Paul. Missionaries went, also, to Africa and to South America, and, in spite of enormous difficulties, brought thousands into the fold. To support, guide, and continue these efforts, a college, familiarly known as the Propaganda, was established in Rome in the early part of the seventeenth century, for the purpose of training young Levites

from all nations and sending them out to missionary countries. The Church, then, as we have it today, owes much of its success and strength to the spirit that arose in Europe after the onslaught of the Reformation had spent much of its force. The revival manifested itself not only in wise legislation, in missionary effort, but in masterful works on theological science and on all questions pertaining to the soul. It was also felt in a determination on the part of the Church to maintain its liberty. While the Protestant sects sank more and more under the thralldom of the State, the old Church proclaimed its God-given right to independence.

It is certainly not out of place to ask here, "What other Church could have done these things? Has it ever been known that one of them has at any time recovered what it had lost?" The truth is that, not only generally, but universally, what the sects lose is gone forever. Does any one suppose Protestantism of today will ever win back its lost faith or its waning influence? Has not the story of Protestantism from its very beginning been a story of concession after concession? It tries to hold a portion of the world

by accommodating itself to the spirit of the world. Concession and compromise have marked its progress from the very beginning. It is built upon shifting sands. From belief in verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, it has come to an acceptance of a teaching that denies all inspiration. From a solafidian (faith alone) theory of the spiritual life, it today has come to admit the denial of the necessity of faith. From proclaiming God is all in all—to the exclusion of any effort on the part of the individual—it has come to bow before the teachers of atheistic evolution or blind chance. Does any one suppose that it will shake off the incubus under which it lies helpless, and become an active spiritual agency? There is no such optimism.

On the other hand, the Catholic Church, passing through centuries of adverse conditions, becomes weakened in head and members. A revolution follows; there are many defections. Whole nations fall away. Suddenly, after the shock of attack, it arouses itself, shakes off the shackles that bind it, becomes itself once more, and goes out conquering and to conquer. It does this because it is divine, and not a human organi-

zation ; because its life is from above, its existence supernally guaranteed.

Protestantism was at its highest fifty years after Luther pinned his theses to the church door at Wittenberg. Since that time it has been declining, relatively in numbers, absolutely in faith and as a religious influence. The Catholic Church grows stronger and more strong. It is today a greater force in the world than ever before. It rests upon the foundation of the Counter-Reformation, which, after all, was but the effort which in dark days enabled the Church to recover herself.

In dealing with the subject of The Counter-Reformation I have not felt called upon to mention the great religious orders, vast and indispensable as their work was. I have confined myself to the organizations that sprang up at the particular time.

TO THE CATHOLIC READER

The chief business of Protestantism for the four hundred years of its existence has been to vilify the Catholic Church. It does this as of necessity. If the Catholic Church were not degraded throughout, if it had not been incurably bad, there was no justification for the religious revolution of the sixteenth century. If the Church does not continue to be the Babylon that Protestantism declares it to be, there is no excuse for the continuance of the sects. Hence, it devolved upon the Innovators at the beginning, as it devolved upon their followers down the ages, to represent the Church as a false guide in matters of faith and a corruptionist in the domain of morals. To show this was Protestantism's self-imposed task; and surely it has carried on the work with unflinching assiduity! It exaggerated and multiplied, reiterated accusation, and falsified so consistently and so cleverly that men in time learned to accept as fact what it had so skillfully fabricated. The business goes on still. In

every non-Catholic school, whether state or sectarian, misrepresentation is always in order. The Protestant pulpit is not rampant as it formerly was. But associations composed entirely of Protestants or indifferents conduct the work of slander in secret; and a number of widely-circulated newspapers have no object in existence but to circulate calumny about the Catholic Church. The propaganda has been so successful that multitudes believe the slanders that have been uttered, and are prepared to accept any more that may come. Many honestly regard the Church as the fruitful parent of cunning and crime. There are, of course, some who refuse to accept the word of a professional vilifier. Others consider the retailing of scandal a poor business for any organization. But the papers live and thrive.

In the face of this, what is to be done? Little more than to keep ourselves informed. It would be idle to follow up all stories that are told about us. It would be a loss of time to try to enlighten those who, on the word of some vile publication, believe the accusations that are made. But we ought always be prepared to answer honest in-

quiry, and we must, at least occasionally, meet the slanderer and expose his ignorance or his malice.

For our own peace of mind, we ought to remember that we are not obliged to rush to the defense of every one that may be attacked. Our church does not depend upon individuals, nor is it tied to them, no matter what position they may have held. If impartial history condemns them, let us condemn them. But let us find impartial history—no easy task—though not so difficult today as it was twenty-five years ago. The travesty of truth that so long passed for history in the English language has had some rude shocks recently. Even professors and high school teachers are beginning to see this. Some of them are candid enough to admit that the reformers did add lying to an otherwise extensive repertory.

It were idle to deny that some few churchmen of great prominence were wicked. Most of them were good, many of them saints, but it would be marvelous, indeed, if sometimes an unworthy person did not attain to power. We are not called upon to question what is definitely ascer-

tained. Our church, as already said, does not depend even on its rulers.

In the matter of argument the Protestant has this advantage over us, that he is tied to nothing; neither to any particular doctrine, nor to any sect, race or period. Protestantism can repudiate its whole past without sacrificing what it never had—consistency. It has another advantage in this, that it is constantly hunting for scandals in the Catholic Church, while we never bother about what may occur in the enemy's ranks.

But in spite of all efforts to destroy it, the Church maintains and increases its strength, while Protestantism, as Luther and Calvin knew it, scarcely exists today. It has been killed by its own absurdity. Were it not for the immense worldly backing it had, it would have died long ago; indeed, would never have taken root in human society. For you may search all the systems of philosophy and religion that have at any time engaged human thought, and you will not find another so inconsistent as Protestantism. It is truly marvelous that intelligent human beings could have at any time found comfort in it. In-

deed, closer scrutiny of the situation will show that those who have found strength and consolation in Protestantism, never did understand it, but have always taken it for what it is not.

ANABAPTISTS

A name given to a Reformation sect by its enemies, and implies that these sectarians insisted on baptizing again those who had been baptized in infancy. The Anabaptists denied that they were conferring a *second* baptism, as, in their opinion, the one administered in childhood was wholly void.

The sect arose in Luther's land and in Luther's time. It went even further than the Wittenberg reformer. The ex-Augustinian monk cast aside the authority of the Church, but truckled to the State. The Anabaptists rejected both authorities. They were the Bolsheviks, or I. W. W., of their time, and were such on religious grounds. They read the Bible, as they supposed, more accurately, and interpreted it more consistently, than Luther. In the exercise of their private judgment they learned that the Christian man must be free. For him there is no authority, civil or religious.

Naturally, they soon divided into sects. Some became very extreme, going even to the extent

of holding goods and wives in common. Polygamy was openly practised among them. One of the leaders, Rothmann, had four wives; John of Leyden, four times four.

They came in conflict with the civil authorities, and were denounced by all, Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists. As usually happens, the peaceful and law-abiding, of which there were some, suffered with the others. The *Britannica* says of them: "The Lutherans and Zwinglians never converted the Anabaptists. Those who yielded to stress of persecution fell back into Papalism and went to swell the tide of the Catholic reaction."

The extreme form of the sect has scarcely any existence to-day, though some of their teaching lives in the Baptists. The Mennonites, an offshoot of the Anabaptists, are said to have in the different countries a following of a quarter of a million. Of these about a fifth are in the United States. The only opposition to civil authority now manifested by them is a refusal to seek or accept office and to bear arms. Nor do they always adhere in practice to their principles in these matters.

THE BAPTISTS

The Baptists are, in some measure, the most consistent of the Protestant sects. The others, while rejecting the authority of the Catholic Church, have accepted its views on the sacrament of Baptism. The Baptists insist upon a literal interpretation of the words of Holy Writ, hence dip their members.

We must also give them credit for their staunch refusal to allow State interference in questions of religion. Too many of the other sects have been deplorably Erastian. If the Baptists are bigots, it is only what might be expected from their creed, which is Calvinistic.

The Baptists date from the early part of the seventeenth century. They had attained some importance about 1644, when they began to be called by the name that still remains with them. They were dissenters and suffered some persecution in England under Charles II. The sect was then, as it is now, largely confined to English-speaking peoples.

Like the Anabaptists, this sect rejects infant baptism and regards immersion as the only valid form of administration. The sacrament is not, however, considered necessary in the Catholic sense of the word. It is but a symbol of regeneration, not a means of grace. Hence, children dying before receiving the rite are saved. And of adults, only those who have already been born again can be admitted to baptism. A profession of faith is demanded before one is admitted to the rite.

They have also a Eucharistic service, which, like Baptism, confers no grace, and is but a symbol. On this point they have "Close Communion" and "Open Communion" Baptists, the one excluding outsiders from the Eucharistic services, the other admitting them.

The Baptists early suffered the fate of the other Calvinistic sects. Division entered. The "General Baptists" were "Arminian," teaching that Christ died for all; the "Particular Baptists," following more strictly the Calvinistic doctrine, held that He died only for the elect. The latter became indifferent to conversions, on the ground that it was idle to appeal to the non-

elect. Many of the General Baptists lapsed into Unitarianism.

The Baptist Church in the United States owes its origin to Roger Williams, who left England in search of freedom of conscience, in 1631. His story is well known. He was one of the few Puritans who, flying from persecution, did not himself persecute.

The Baptists suffered in America as they did in England, because of their attitude towards the civil power. They consequently grew slowly until 1750. The nineteenth century saw considerable Baptist increase in this country, though there were serious divisions in the body. These divisions have produced many sects: *The Baptist Church of Christ, The Campbellites, The Dunkards, The Freewill Baptists, Predestinarian Baptists, Old-School Baptists, Seventh-Day Baptists, and many others.*

The Baptists come next to the Methodists among the Protestant sects in the United States, and have about five million members, of whom a third are colored.

CONGREGATIONALISTS

To the outsider it would appear that, with the exception of Baptist teaching on the first sacrament, Congregationalists and Baptists differ little, if at all. Both sprang up about the same time, and under similar conditions; both are Dissenters; both Calvinistic; both alike in church polity. Each separate congregation is self-governing in either confession; and, it may also be added, both churches have contributed largely to Unitarianism.

The Congregationalists are of the extreme type of religionists who sprang up in England in the time of Elizabeth, and later. They have been known as Nonconformists, Puritans, Dissenters, Independents, — Nonconformists because they would not accept the State religion; Puritans because they wished to purge Protestantism of every vestige of Catholic ritual; Dissenters, or Independents, because they refused to accept the rule either of the English Episcopacy or the Scotch Presbyteries. They de-

manded that each congregation should be free to decide for itself in all matters of religion and conscience. Their motto was, "No head, priest, prophet, or king save Christ." They suffered persecution under Elizabeth and the Stuarts, and many fled to Holland, where they could enjoy freedom of worship. Like the Baptists, the Congregationalists refused to concede jurisdiction in religious matters to the State.

The "Pilgrim Fathers," who were of the English refugees in Holland, came to America in 1620. Here the name "Congregationalists" supplanted that of "Independents."

Theoretically, the Congregationalists make each separate church supreme. But in practice they are subject to the prevailing opinions of the entire body. The increase in Unitarianism among their members showed the leaders that some bond of union must be maintained. The Congregationalists in America claim about two-thirds of a million members.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America—this is its official title—is a lineal descendant of the Church of England as by law established. It is scarcely necessary to say that this latter is the church begun by Henry VIII, and developed under his son, Edward, and his daughter, Elizabeth.

The Church of England had followers in America from about the middle of the sixteenth century, but organization here scarcely began before the early years of the seventeenth. Its chief success was attained in Maryland and Virginia, where it enjoyed some of the privileges of the Established Church in the old land. In the Northern States, where the "Pilgrims" were, it was hated and feared. The Pilgrims had left the old land to escape its tyranny, and were gravely disappointed to see it following them to the new. The consequence was that while the Church persecuted in the South, it was persecuted in the North. During many

years, being without bishops here, it remained subject to the Bishop of London.

The greatest trial of the church came with the Revolution. Some remained steadfast in their devotion to England, while others were whole-heartedly with the Colonies. The question of allegiance became a very important one. There was also a serious difficulty in securing bishops when it became evident that an American organization must be formed. The English bishops, from whom succession was naturally sought, could not consecrate anyone who refused to take the oath of allegiance to the British crown. No one taking such an oath could live in America. In time, the difficulty was solved, and the Episcopal Church, as it was now called, became an independent organization.

The Church of England and its daughter, the Protestant Episcopal Church, allow greater latitude of belief than is found anywhere else. Some churchmen claim to be as Catholic as the Pope, if not a little more so; others can hardly be said to have any supernatural faith. To some the word "Protestant" in the title is very objection-

able; others would not part with it under any consideration.

The Episcopal Church not only has a vast variety of opinion within its fold, but it also had a genuine schism in 1873, when the Reformed Episcopal Church was formed. Before that it was profoundly shaken in England and in America by the "Tractarian Movement" of 1833, which finally sent Newman and a number of others to seek shelter in the Catholic Church.

The Episcopal Church has nearly one million communicants in the United States and its possessions, though the number of those who call themselves Episcopalians is about three times as many.

METHODISTS

Methodism is an offshoot of Anglicanism. Its founder, John Wesley, was an Anglican minister and the son of an Anglican minister. It does not appear that he at any time intended to leave that church.

"Methodist" was a nickname given to a small organization of young men whom Charles Wesley, a younger brother of John, had brought together in Oxford. The company was also in derision called "the Holy Club." John soon became leader of these young men.

Later, in his travels he came in contact with the Moravian Brethren and was very much influenced by them.

The Methodist movement dates from 1739, and is therefore over two hundred years later than the first Reformation efforts. At the time, the two brothers, aided by George Whitefield, began their revivals, religion in England was at a very low ebb. Indeed, spirituality had almost died out among Protestant peoples. Methodist

success was, then, in no small measure due to the fact that, after the battle of the Reformation was over, the "reformed" world settled back into a condition of indifference.

John Wesley preached in Georgia some years before 1739, but with little success. Later, his friend, George Whitefield, came to America, remained some time, and influenced many. Whitefield was an open-air preacher of the popular type and of great power. The religious revival known as the "Great Awakening" is of this time. In these revivals "converts" manifested their repentance by most extraordinary demonstrations—bodily contortions and frenzy.

Wesley and Whitefield, however, separated on the question of predestination. Whitefield was utterly Calvinistic; Wesley, Arminian—one favored the "horrible decree," the other modified it. Wesley's views prevailed. Whitefield may be regarded as the founder of the sect known as the Calvinistic Methodists, Wesley as the founder of the larger body.

Methodism in the United States dates from 1766, when a preacher named Embury ad-

dressed a congregation of four in his own house. The movement grew steadily, but it received a serious setback in the war of Revolution. The preachers were chiefly English, and naturally, like Wesley himself, were opposed to the Colonies in their strife for independence.

When peace came the Methodists, always practical, saw the necessity in America of an organization that no longer derived jurisdiction from England. This came in 1784, with Asbury as superintendent.

The question of slavery caused a division in 1845, when the Methodist Church, South, came into existence. Difference of opinion, tastes, and interests have caused defections at other times. Hence, there are many sects in Methodism. Together, they number over six million members in the United States, and are the largest Protestant body we have. Their success is largely owing to their great activity, and their refusal to apply any dogmatic test.

They are to be found in other countries: Canada, England, Scotland, Ireland. They have also entered Latin countries. In these their success is so poor that one is inclined to infer

the existence of motives other than the hope of making converts. It has been often asserted that their chief business in Rome is to annoy the Pope.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

The Presbyterian Church derives its name from the fact that it is ruled by elders or presbyters. It rejects episcopacy, and admits of no higher functionary than the minister, or teaching elder. On the other hand, its government has nothing in common with Congregationalism. Each congregation has indeed a ruling body composed of the pastor and lay elders. But above this is the presbytery of the district, and above the presbytery is the Synod, and above the Synod a supreme body known as the General Assembly. Presbyterianism is, then, a highly organized system.

In worship each congregation enjoys some latitude. But, generally, the service consists of preaching, singing, and readings from the Bible.

Presbyterian faith differs little from that of the Congregational churches, and is distinctively Calvinistic. This does not, however, imply that they all hold to the "horrible decree" on predestination and reprobation. Many are decidedly Arminian in doctrine.

While Presbyterianism is closely allied to the Congregational and Baptist Churches, it is own sister to the French Huguenot and the Dutch Reformed Churches. From these it scarcely differs except in the name given it in English-speaking countries.

John Knox brought Presbyterianism from Geneva to Scotland. From Scotland it passed over to Ireland, in the Ulster plantation under James I. While American Presbyterians have come from different lands, an Ulsterman gets credit for having organized it here. The conflict waged for many years in England between Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism was renewed in this land.

As happened to the other sects, the Presbyterians suffered from secession and division. There are about twelve different bodies calling themselves Presbyterian in this country. They have also, throughout their history, contributed largely to swell the ranks of Unitarianism, a sect that denies the proper divinity of Christ.

Presbyterians throughout the world, exclusive of the Dutch Reformed and Huguenots, num-

ber about five millions, almost a half of whom are in the United States and Canada. Following the example of their founder, John Calvin, they everywhere take an active part in politics.

QUAKERISM

The founder of the "Society of Friends," George Fox, was born in England in 1624, about a hundred years from the date of Luther's revolt. He was of the Church of England, and his parents were anxious to dedicate him to its service. He, however, conceived an aversion to its "hireling ministry." His early career reminds us of the oriental visionary, Guatama Buddha.

"Visions" and "revelations" which he had in his teens prompted him to leave home and submit himself to all manner of privation in order to reach an "inner light." When this "light" came it showed him queer things. Ecclesiastical ceremonies and institutions were to be abolished. The "inner light" alone was sufficient, it alone was to be followed. This was simply Luther's teaching brought to its logical extreme. The "light" forbade him to swear even in a court of justice, to take off his hat in the presence of royalty, to give titles of honor

to anyone, to wear ornaments, or to go to war. It also ruled out art, music, dancing, field-sports. Furthermore, "The Friends" in time refused to pay tithes to the established church, and entered into marriage without appealing to its ministry. Necessarily, all this brought hatred and punishment upon the "Society of Friends."

During the reign of Charles II thousands of them were sent to prison, where a goodly number of them died. Others were sold into slavery. In Massachusetts they were treated very cruelly by the Puritans, who hanged four of them on Boston Common. Later they found asylum in Pennsylvania, a colony belonging to one of their number, William Penn.

But no persecution could dampen the ardor of these early zealots. They would convert the whole world to the "inner light." It is said that some left England to preach to the Pope, while others hurried to Constantinople to perform a similar service for the Sultan.

Though the "inner light" is to them all-sufficient in theory, yet the Quakers have some rules of discipline which they impose on disciples. They reject creeds, but still hold to some

of the fundamentals of Christianity. In government they come near the Presbyterian model.

Their early missionary spirit has died and their number has gradually diminished. Divisions also came. At present in the United States they claim only a little over a hundred thousand members.

UNITARIANS

That which is mainly distinctive in this body is their rejection of the Trinity as understood by Christians generally. Christ is to them not God, though many of them regard Him as, in some limited sense, divine. He is a teacher, but not a Saviour. There is but one truly divine person in the Godhead, hence the name Unitarian. Beyond this, the sect's doctrine is rather indefinite. It is a religion of co-operation, not unity of faith. In church government it is Congregational.

While very early in the history of Christianity heretics arose to attack the doctrine of the Trinity, still Unitarianism of to-day dates from the middle of the sixteenth century. It began in Poland. The latter part of the eighteenth century saw its rise in England, its founder having seceded from the Established Church. The law was invoked against them, and they continued a proscribed sect until the early part of the nineteenth century.

Unitarianism began to take form in the United States about the middle of the eighteenth century. Its first adherents were largely from Congregationalism, though even some Episcopalians joined them. Unitarian theology got a strong footing in Harvard University in the early part of the nineteenth century. The tendency of Unitarianism has been towards Rationalism. It has been active in these destructive attacks upon the Bible, often called the "Higher Criticism."

The number of professed Unitarians in the United States is small, not even a hundred thousand, though it is much to be feared that Unitarian principles have invaded many of the sects, especially the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies.

UNIVERSALISTS

The Universalists are a liberal Protestant body whose distinctive teaching is that God will finally restore all men to holiness and happiness. God is Love, He is Universal Father. They admit, however, that He may punish sin temporarily. They generally hold the Unitarian view of God.

In England the first Universalist congregation was organized in the middle of the eighteenth century. Twenty years later the doctrine began to be preached in the United States. It has a small membership, scarcely more than fifty thousand in the United States.

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR AN OFF- SPRING OF THE REFORMATION

The Peace of Augsburg, which in 1555 brought to a close the wars immediately connected with the activities of the Reformation, was much of a makeshift, and hence, left considerable room for trouble. Misunderstandings were of frequent occurrence and animosities grew apace.

The task of preserving Lutheranism had been given to the Princes, who, according to the doctrine of the Apostate Monk, were the only ones entitled to freedom of conscience. The principle *cujus regio ejus religio*, everywhere part of the new evangel, gave the secular ruler supreme authority in spirituals. The most that would be conceded to a subject was the right to move to another province, if he found the religion imposed on him by his prince unacceptable. If he remained he must conform. It is asserted that the Palatinate changed its religion four times in sixty years, at the bidding of its rulers.

As questions of conscience were in the keeping

of the civil power, it was inevitable that "the last argument of kings," the sword, should come frequently into play. The Thirty Years' War was thus the child of the Reformation. This awful struggle which devastated Germany, made a desert of many fair provinces, and, besides preventing its natural increase, reduced its population to about a third, began in 1618, immediately after the celebration of the first anniversary of Luther's nailing the theses to the door of his church at Wittenberg. This prolonged and sanguinary struggle manifested, beyond the usual atrocities of war, such crimes as are inevitable when armies of irresponsible mercenaries roam at will through defenseless territories. It had also the element of personal hatred which is ever present in religious wars, and which usually leaves no room for mercy.

It is not my purpose to enter in detail into a struggle that continued for a generation, with varied fortunes; nor do I intend to discuss the merits of the cause, or the character of its chief actors. My only desire is to indicate that, according to all history, this politico-religious struggle, with all its dread consequences, is the

child of the Reformation. Nor is there a challenge to this statement in the fact that Catholic France, at the bidding of Richelieu, allied itself with the Protestant princes. France's action was, indeed, political; but the great war which bled Germany to feebleness, and involved most of Western Europe, was the burly offspring of Luther's rebellion.

The peace of Westphalia in 1648 came when Europe was weary of the struggle, and when some of the combatants were fairly exhausted. But as the Peace of Augsburg left the way open to the Thirty Years' War, so the Peace of Westphalia left the seeds of subsequent animosities and sanguinary struggles.

To speak of a conflict as a religious war does not imply that political conditions are eliminated. For unless religion can arouse secular interest its appeal to arms must fail. This was especially true of the period under consideration. We have already seen to what extent Luther was able to engage the sympathy of secular Princes, by an appeal to their appetites, or their interests. Without the active support of civil rulers the Reformation would have fallen to the ground. The

fact that National ambitions played their part in the great conflict does not take from it the stigma of being a religious war. The religion of the time was so bound up with political scheming as to be inseparable from it. Lest I might be accused of straining the point, I quote from a few Protestant authors.

Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. II, page 109, says: "A comparison of the religious wars produced by the Reformation with the Crusades shows clearly the great change that had passed over the spirit of Europe. The Crusades had been purely religious. They represented solely the enthusiasm of a people for dogmatic interests, and they were maintained for more than two centuries by an effort of unexampled self-sacrifice. In the religious wars, on the other hand, the secular and ecclesiastical elements were very evenly balanced. The object sought was political power, but difference of religious belief formed the lines of demarcation, separating the hostile coalitions, and created the enthusiasm by which the struggle was maintained. The spirit of the theologian was sufficiently powerful to inundate Europe with blood, but only when united with the ambi-

tion of a politician. This phase of opinions continued for more than a century after the Reformation."

The Britannica article, *Thirty Years' War*, says: "It was primarily a religious war and was waged with the bitterness characteristic of such wars, but at the same time political and feudal quarrels were interwoven with the religious question, with the consequence that the armies, considering themselves as their masters' retainers rather than champions of a cause, plundered and burned everywhere. In a war based on the principle *cujus regio ejus religio* it was vain to expect either the professional or the national type of army to display its virtues."

The International Encyclopædia article, *Thirty Years' War*, says: "It is the name given to the great European struggle which marked the climax of the Reformation, closing the period of distinctively religious politics, and opening that in which secular statecraft took the place of the ecclesiastical. The Religious Peace of Augsburg afforded no permanent settlement of the questions that had been stirred up by the Protestant revolution."

It is not necessary to quote further in an effort to show what is obvious. The devastating Thirty Years' War came as an inevitable result of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century.

OTHER CONSEQUENCES OF THE REFORMATION

That a movement, so gigantic in its proportions and so novel in its innovations, should have exercised tremendous influence upon succeeding ages is but what might have been expected. No matter how inconsistent it may have been, it had force enough to change the face of Christendom and confuse the thought of the centuries that have since elapsed. It exists to-day as a fact of the first magnitude, and as an agency with which all must reckon.

Men may not always see the force of principles, but these, if given time, never fail to work themselves out to their logical conclusions. Men may be inconsistent; movements never are.

When the Reformers rejected authority they took away the keystone of the Christian arch, and it required but a comparatively short time until the edifice began to crumble. The unity for which Christ prayed can be maintained only by a head, authorized to teach and to govern. It

was easy then to see, as Bossuet has so well shown, that the rejection of any infallible teacher would result in innumerable sects, and would end in each one thinking for himself. The Church of Christ would thus ultimately crumble into atoms, and cease to be a power wherever the principles of the Reformation obtained. What was predicted by the French Churchman has happened. The Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies have broken up into innumerable sects, to the grave scandal of all sincere Christians, and even of the Pagan and Moslem worlds.

The right of private judgment, and the principle of individual illumination, justify all the aberrations that have since occurred. The wildest fanatic, proclaiming the most grotesque theories, finds himself secure in Luther's teaching. For can he not claim his indefeasible right to his own interpretation of scripture; nay, more, can he not insist that he has special revelations authorizing the wildest doctrine? How can a church, that is no more infallible than he, deny his right to receive messages and interpret them? Every fanatic, every Mad Mullah of the Orient or Occident, can appeal confidently to the right

granted him by the glorious Reformation. The Civil powers cannot permit these things always, but they ought to know that when, in the interests of public order or public decency, they check the frenzy of some "prophet" they are repudiating the teaching of Wittenberg.

The Reformers' inconsistency in dealing with the Bible could not fail to produce the deplorable condition of to-day. For in rejecting the authority of the Church, they compelled the scriptures to witness unto themselves—something that all law and all common sense forbid. "If I bear witness of myself," says Christ, "My witness is not true." The method adopted by the older Protestants of taking a few texts and making them testify to the other scriptures is absurd. For how can a few texts witness unless their own character is established? Who or what testifies to them? And most assuredly there is not one of them that gives any canon of scripture, or in any way indicates what writings constitute the Bible.

This slipshod dealing with Holy Writ, as well as the rejection of an infallible interpreter, have exposed the Bible to the attacks which Ra-

tionalism and Materialism have made upon it. It was inevitable that the cold page should suffer from having lost the living voice, divinely appointed to expound and defend it. Revelation to-day is without authority among the sects, because the Innovators of the Sixteenth Century hated the Papacy. Most of the Rationalism, Materialism, Infidelity and Atheism of the last four hundred years sprang from the same cause. These evils came as a natural consequence of the rejection of an infallible teacher. The Bible, robbed of its guardian and protector, was powerless against the allied forces of the enemy.

To what extent the Reformers are responsible for the worldliness of the present is too complicated a question to be considered here. But it must be apparent to all that the worship of power and wealth has been one of the sects' cardinal weaknesses. We need not be old to remember that before the war came to make some temporary change, the world gloried in the achievements of Protestant Germany, Protestant England and Protestant America. How the finger of scorn was pointed at such countries as weak, benighted and Catholic Spain. For the moment

we are chastened, and therefore less given to boasting. But the time will come again when the world, like its prototype, Pharaoh, will forget its chastisement and resume its old ways. Once more, great wealth, great cities, great commerce, if not actually great armies and great navies, will be the beautiful ideal of the American Protestant mind.

It has been said that the war which has just come to a close is the direct result of Luther's rebellion. This may not be as far-fetched as, at first view, it appears to be. It is unquestionably true that it is the dread outcome of the principles for which the Reformers stood, and of the animosities which they introduced into the world. There were divisions and hatreds before the Reformation, but they were not organized into a system as they have been since.

That the low estimate of marriage, of which we complain to-day, began with the Reformation does not admit of question. Luther's views on the matter, his consenting that his friend, the Landgrave of Hesse, should have two wives, and what Chesterton calls the "Bluebeard Marriages" of Henry VIII, paved the way for the

evil conditions that exist to-day. No doctrine, proclaimed to be Christian, dealt such a fell blow to the sanctity of the marriage bond as that which came from the Reformers. The foundation upon which society rests is undermined by their action.

It would not be true to accuse Protestants of introducing that other monster evil, race-suicide. Unfortunately, in modern times, this crime owes its spread to a nation which is nominally Catholic, but which gave up the practice of its religion that it might indulge this wickedness. But, while the children of the Reformation did not reintroduce an evil which Christianity had banished from Europe, there is no question but to-day they take rather kindly to it. But I deal with this subject elsewhere.

The indirect results of the Reformation are equally evil. The division of Christendom militated most adversely against the spread of Christ's teaching. If Europe could have been united when the counter-Reformation spirit arose, that spirit, instead of spending itself in a struggle for faith at home, could have gone into Pagan lands where great conquests for Christ might have been

made. But, while a few did actually take up the work of evangelization abroad, the majority found more than enough to occupy them at home.

When the time did come that missionaries could go out in considerable numbers, they found themselves discredited by division. The intelligent Pagan could tell the Christian teacher that he had better stay at home until Christians had agreed upon Christ's teaching. It was idle to preach to them a gospel which was disputed even in its stronghold. To make confusion still more confounded, missionaries of one creed opposed and sometimes denounced those of another, to the great scandal of the listening Pagans. So, the division of Christendom, introduced by the Reformation, effectively prevented the evangelization of Asia, Africa, and other pagan lands. Had these divisions entered some centuries earlier they would have had a still more terrible effect.

It is due, then, to the religious revolution of the sixteenth century that Asia and Africa remain almost solidly pagan or Moslem. The Reformers, no doubt, did not foresee the far-reaching consequences of their rebellion. But, as

already said, movements work themselves out logically.

I have already referred to the assertion that Luther is responsible for the war whose effects still disturb the world. Certainly if Christendom were united, as Christ intended it should be, there would be no war. Were there an impartial tribunal to which the nations could submit their grievances, there would be no occasion for the dread slaughter, or for the baffling conditions that exist to-day.

We are casting about for some substitute for the divinely appointed judge whose authority has been rejected. A League of Nations is to be called upon to do the work that could be done very simply and very effectively, had not passion been allowed to disturb the order of pre-Reformation times. The Father of Christendom could settle his children's troubles if they would but submit them. This the Europe of to-day refuses to do; and Europe is paying the penalty of its insubordination. America, Asia, and Africa find themselves deeply involved, if not in the sin, at least, in its punishment.

Well, indeed, may the world weep the Re-

formation. Its dreaded consequences remain with us, and manifest themselves in wars, hatreds, misrepresentations, and a general paralysis of Christian endeavor. The race has become so accustomed to this condition that it has almost forgotten the true way.

THE WEAKNESS OF PROTESTANTISM

It were idle and unfair to deny the great natural virtues of Protestants. They are, as a rule, loyal and devoted to the nation, and their civic duties are faithfully discharged. Fond of law and order, they maintain external decorum, attend to sanitation and promote the welfare of each community. Their generosity is unexampled, many of them contributing munificently to every good cause. Catholic Churches and institutions are frequently beneficiaries of their liberality.

They also strive for good laws and are ever active in the work of civic reform. In the matter of promoting temperance, while not a unit, they have been all along the leading influence. Whatever criticism I have offered, or may offer, is of the system, not of individuals.

They probably will not feel hurt by my saying that it was a grievous, if not a fatal, error, to consent to the secularization of education. To bring up Christian children in an atmosphere

from which religion has been sedulously banished, appears to me a betrayal of the cause of Christ. Nor, do I think it justified by the fact that many difficulties would attend an effort to impart doctrinal instruction. A way could be found for doing it, and, though it should entail expense and sacrifice, surely both would find ample compensation in the results. The assumption that, if the schools were made purely secular, religious instruction would be imparted in the home and Sunday-school, has not been justified by the event. If indifference to religion is characteristic of the hour, as it certainly is, Protestantism must bear the chief blame. Had it contended for an education under the aegis of religion, a way would have been found of imparting it in a manner satisfactory to all the sects. Many Protestants, to-day, regret that their churches have not been more far-seeing in such a vital matter.

Protestantism has scored a second failure in its dealing with the difficulties existing between capital and labor. Indeed, it is not easy to see that the churches have accomplished anything in this vexed matter. Yet, they ought to have been

able to do much. For while the laborer has not, as a rule, attended the churches of the sects, capital has been almost wholly in the hands of Protestant church-going people. Yet it does not seem that his religion has been able to make the plutocrat less avaricious, or more kindly disposed towards the working man. Protestantism has been as unable to bring both together in friendly discussion of economics, as it has been unable to bring them to sit in the same pew. It has, guiltily or otherwise, allowed them to remain apart and mutually hostile as though they were not of the same flesh and blood, or children of the same Father. Here we have a great misfortune which ought to have been avoided.

In the matter of divorce the Protestant Churches have been singularly helpless. In fact, they have taken no stand on the matter; but, in almost every case, have allowed the provisions of secular enactment to be their guide. In the beginning they would permit the breaking of the bond for one or two specified causes. But, as time went on, and as State laws became lax, the churches yielded one position after another, until now they candidly decline to assert themselves.

This is deplorable. For who will deny that divorce constitutes a moral question, and moral questions should be in the keeping of the Churches.

There are among Protestants many who utterly abhor divorce, and who, therefore, regret that the churches are unable to put any check on the monstrous and growing evil. But when the organizations are powerless, what can individuals do? They have the merit of their protests, and their wholesome views may exercise an influence upon public opinion. Beyond this little is achieved.

The Churches are powerless because they are unnecessary. The Reformation has so declared them. Christian men are proclaimed independent of them; and if some few deem church-going, not only good, but essential, there are so many churches to choose from that, unless all unite in opposing divorce, the opposition of one or of a few would be useless. There is no present prospect that any such united effort will be made. And, if it should, its success would be doubtful. Divorce has already secured a recognized standing in society of all grades.

Far more destructive than divorce, artificial limitation of offspring raises its unblushing head. Under the influence of this, the most devastating of evils,—worse than war, pestilence or famine,—the population gradually diminishes and must ultimately disappear. It is at its worst among the educated and well-to-do. The very stock that the nation should desire to see perpetuated is the particular one that suffers most from this monster evil. As is well-known, it is not the foreigner or the poor, but the native sons and daughters, who live in comfort and enjoy literature, music and the theatre, that offend most grievously in this matter. The situation is so well understood that it hardly needs elucidation. Suffice it to say that according to a present day statistician it requires an average of almost four children in a family to keep the population up to its present level; and in American families of the better class no such average can be found. It follows, then, that this class is dying out, and, if the entire race were of this type, the human family could count the years beyond which it could not hope to continue.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the Protes-

tant Churches are doing nothing to check this monster evil. Indeed, it is conceded that they are absolutely helpless in the matter. So indifferent are they to it, or so conscious are they of their inability to arrest the progress of this destroyer, that they scarcely discuss it. The pulpit is silent about it. Nor is any organized effort made to arouse the conscience of this generation to an evil that threatens human society, hence, both Church and State. It is a pity that, since the matter is not discussed from its moral side, there should not, at least, be a patriotic appeal made. Surely, the State, if it is to remain strong, should receive a greater tribute from its prosperous and enlightened citizens. The best contribution the present can make to the future of a nation is a numerous, healthy and moral progeny. This the wealthier and more enlightened classes are not giving. The churches stand silently by and see the process of extermination carried on with ever-increasing speed. Nothing is done, nothing attempted.

On the question of sexual morality Protestantism has been strangely silent. Its instruction on this delicate and grave matter is decidedly

meager and indefinite. Protestant catechisms make but brief reference to it, and hence leave the child to itself, to parents or the family physician. The young are bewildered by growing inclination; parents fear to offer advice, or, perhaps, are incapable of giving it; and the physician is consulted only after much harm is done.

That this should be so, is most lamentable. For in the opinion of moralists and sociologists, the sex question is important beyond all others. Indeed, if the evils arising from a wrong course in the matter could be seen in their naked deformity, it would be found that not all the other vices combined,—drunkenness, dishonesty, contention, bad politics—could show such a monstrous record. It is, therefore, utterly deplorable that religious organizations, which hold themselves responsible for the vast majority of the youth of this land, should be so silent on this question.

A short while ago a great effort was made to teach children sex-hygiene, as a substitute for moral instruction. Catholics generally opposed this, because they did not wish to do violence to the minds of the innocent; and further, because

the care of souls is not the proper duty of a physician. Perhaps, Catholics who find in their Church due instruction, did not realize how necessary it is to outsiders. Consideration of the work of the Catholic Church on the one hand, and of non-Catholic churches on the other, will show that the needs of Protestant children, in this particular, are very different from those of Catholic children. The Catholic Church cannot make people chaste against their will. But it certainly leaves no one in doubt as to the importance of purity. The Protestant Churches have not been successful in imparting knowledge on the sex question. Individual love of purity there certainly is, but the churches have not done enough to foster it. It would seem, therefore, that Protestantism fails to combat the greater evils that threaten humanity. It does excellent work in minor matters, and is especially effective in handling such things as offend public taste and decorum. It would bring all classes under the rule of respectability, would eliminate poverty and wretchedness and would destroy drunkenness. Deeper than this it cannot go.

Nor does it endeavor to do all this by moral

suasion. In the matter of intemperance, especially, it invokes the aid of the law—perhaps, the only effective aid in the circumstances. It is, therefore, eminently practical. But even drunkenness, horrible and abominable as it is, does not destroy communities. It debases individuals and makes families wretched. But it does not threaten the race, nor even a people. The genuinely destructive evils are the ones already mentioned; and against these Protestantism, conscious of its inability, declines to struggle.

If I have overstated Protestant failure to cope with the great evils that threaten the existence of human society, I would like to be informed. For there is no joy in thinking that the vast majority of the people of this country are under the spiritual care of organizations that do not rise to the needs of the time.

THE OUTLOOK FOR PROTESTANTISM

We are frequently told that Protestantism is dead; and in support of the statement, our attention is directed to closed or deserted churches, small congregations, secular sermons, and such-like. We are quite aware that all these things have happened and are happening. But still we hold that Protestantism, though dying in some respects, is far from dead.

If Protestantism meant the doctrine of Luther or Calvin it would, indeed, be in a moribund condition. Neither of the great Reformers could get a hearing in our day. If Luther were to return to life, no Lutheran Church would allow him to preach. The same is true of Calvin, whose "horrible decree" would assuredly revolt the temper of this age.

But is the doctrine of either Luther or Calvin necessary to Protestantism? We think it is not. The essence of Protestantism lies in rebellion against Rome. This means revolt against authority, hence private judgment. We take it,

therefore, that everyone who opposes Rome, and insists upon judging for himself in matters of religion, is a good Protestant. While Luther laid down the doctrine of faith alone, and Calvin taught the "horrible decree," still the reflex principle, giving everyone the right to decide for himself or herself, nullifies even the authority of either Reformer. It is not necessary, in order to be a good Protestant, to believe in the divinity of Christ, or the personality of God. If one but follows his private judgment, no matter whither this may lead him, and hates the Catholic Church, he is as good a Protestant as either Luther or Calvin.

It is foolish, then, to say that Protestantism is dead, and, to allege in justification of the assertion, that churches are deserted and camp meetings despised. Nor does it help to add that some preachers refuse to accept the Bible as the inspired word of God, and even question the divinity of Christ. What one's private judgment,—and who can question the findings of private judgment?—accepts, is for him, Protestantism. Your conclusions may be different from those of John Knox or of Zwingli, but Protestantism gives you the

same right to your opinion that is given to them.

Church going is not demanded by Protestantism. Indeed, it would seem to the outsider that, logically, church-going is antagonistic to the system. For the assembly, with its teacher or preacher, is liable to encroach on the right of private judgment. It will not interfere with that other prime requisite of Protestantism, hatred of the Catholic Church. This it will enhance. But it is a menace to private judgment. Empty pews and abandoned churches do not argue the death of Protestantism, though they may indicate that private judgment's discoveries are now different from what they once were.

In matters other than religion Protestantism is much alive.

In our own day and country it has become somewhat intellectual. It would be a mistake to say that it is learned, or that it has attained distinction in any line of scholarship. For it has not. But it has established colleges and universities which it conducts well, at least, from a worldly point of view. It is true those schools repay it by making infidels, if not atheists, of a

goodly percentage of the young men and women who enter their halls, but their graduates are well equipped for the struggle for existence here below. Many of them distinguish themselves in politics, literature, law and medicine. Generally, they are a well-behaved people who preserve an agreeable decorum and refrain from flaunting their unbelief, if they should be unbelievers, before the public.

In America, as well as in some European countries, wealth gives Protestantism a predominance in society and in the formation of public opinion. Indeed, it would often appear that a monopoly is the proper word in the matter. For in such things Catholicism can exercise little influence, and has not learned to make use even of the little power it possesses. Hence, it appears safe to say that the American temper is molded by Protestantism, which also regulates all social usage. Who will venture to call a system which exercises such mighty influence in this mighty land, dead? No, Protestantism is much alive.

The same massive power is behind every movement which claims to be engaged in striving for social betterment. Clubs and other organizations

that work to secure changes in our laws, with a view to improving social or economic conditions, are generally Protestant. If Catholics interfere at all, it is, as a rule, to prevent the passage of some enactment subtly framed to hurt Catholic schools or other institutions in the care of the Church. Sometimes, it is to stop a misguided movement, such as that of imposing sex-instruction upon innocent children in the public schools, or to baffle a scheme aimed at still further reducing parental authority, and making children wards of the State. Catholics, then, scarcely initiate anything, though they are often called upon to checkmate hostile design.

In politics, too, at least outside the big cities, Protestants can have what they unitedly demand. There is nothing to resist their combined effort. Fortunately the country at large, and even the separate communities keep, as a rule, away from the religious issue. But seldom can a Catholic be given first place on a ticket, and, generally speaking, it would be fatal to any proposed legislation to be suspected of having originated in a Catholic brain.

So, Protestantism in English-speaking coun-

tries (Ireland excepted), instead of being dead or dying, is all powerful in commerce, society, politics, and is paramount in education. The only danger that confronts it is the greatest of all, the gradual decline of population. Defections from the Protestant Churches, indeed, there are. But vacated places could be easily filled by a wholesome increase in succeeding generations. Now, however, Protestants, especially those of the educated and prosperous classes, seem bent on the extermination of the human family. This is the one menace, and a grave one it is. Divorce is bad enough, but, as a race exterminator, it is but a trifle compared with the other. The ravages caused by this evil are likely to be felt more and more as modern ideas of life gain acceptance; and the class which Protestantism esteems most of all, the children of wealth, will be the chief sufferers. But this is elsewhere noticed.

As already said, neither fervor in devotion nor exactitude in faith is essential to Protestantism. If either were, then would the children of the Reformation be in a bad way. For the most noteworthy fact of the present time is the rapidity with which faith is disappearing from Protestant

Christianity, if Christianity it may be called. Surely, if the process of whittling down the body of doctrine proceeds in the next twenty-five years, as it has in the past few decades, little will be left. The Bible, which Protestantism once claimed as especially its own, is scarcely now any more than the sacred books of non-Christian religions. The divinity of Christ is not always asserted. There are men teaching in Protestant universities who do not believe in a personal God; and many of these universities accept the philosophy of Kant, which undermines all belief. Hence, young people of both sexes wander about these schools, with a tremendous void in their hearts, and an eagerness for such diversion and amusement as will enable them to escape the gloom that loss of God brings to the soul. Here we come squarely against Protestantism's supreme crime.

The Protestant churches generally are satisfied with this condition. That they have sold their birth-right, and lost their Christian inheritance, concerns them not at all. They are engaged in "big things"; erecting great schools, enriching libraries, endowing hospitals, establishing museums, patronizing science. What more is

necessary? This they will continue to do, even on a larger scale. Protestantism has many millionaires, some of them childless, most of them leaving small families. A great portion of their wealth will go towards perpetuating their names in massive structures, dedicated, no doubt, to noble purposes. Protestantism will become very rich in goodly edifices, managed on strictly business principles. It will take care of the body, and aim at giving every young man and woman an opportunity of making his or her way in this life; but it is giving up, and will soon have utterly given up, steering any one's bark to the eternal shore. Protestantism is intelligent worldliness. It has practically abandoned the supernatural. It is giving the religion of Christ an easy death, and will, no doubt, bury the remains with honor.

Of this consent to the euthanasia of Christianity I must acquit the Episcopalians. The Protestant Episcopal Church of America is not satisfied with itself. There is, it is true, a distinctly low-church element, which differs little, if at all, from those I have been describing. But there is a party which, while it makes itself amusing by its pretensions, still longs for better things. Again and

again, it asserts that it is part of the grand whole; that it is united in unbroken continuity with the Church of the Apostles; that it has valid orders and that, therefore, it administers valid sacraments. So strongly does it feel on this question that it is pained when one challenges its assumption. But the outsider will see in these positive assertions, and in this sensitiveness to contradiction, a lingering misgiving about the truth of the claims. Catholics are not engaged in defending the Apostolicity of their church, nor do they worry when some one questions the validity of their orders.

But while remarking upon this, I freely testify to the value of the Episcopalian attitude. Neither the English Establishment, nor its American daughter, is wholly at ease. Every movement among Protestants looking towards the reunion of Christendom comes from one or the other. They alone among the sects have any conception of the Mystic Body of Christ; they alone are unwilling to see the seamless garment divided.

It is true they are inconsistent. Indeed, viewed from this standpoint, they are far behind the Baptists or other Independents. It is their spirit,

not their logic, that we commend. We rejoice in the fact that they are not satisfied with inherited error. False doctrine is not improved by being handed down. The Episcopalians know this. They are an enlightened and cultured body. An adherence to the past, and the old-time English dislike of the Pope hold them, for the present, in bondage. But some day a sense of the incongruity of their present attitude will bid them break the bonds and declare their freedom.

In that day, which heaven speed, they will see the necessity of embracing that which they are now copying. The copy, no matter how good, is but a cheap thing; the work of the Master is priceless.

But in order that they may be possessors of the Master's work, that they may be incorporated on the Mystic Body, and receive nourishment from its life, they must humble themselves and approach in the spirit of wanderers returning home. It will not do to demand concessions, or assume the attitude of a high contracting party. The Church of Christ is not a combination of parts, but is organically one. Its Founder has made it such, and it were treason to proclaim it different. One must enter by the door into the sheep-fold.

A WORD ON ANGLICAN ORDERS

I shall not go into a question which for Catholics has been definitely settled by the decision of Leo XIII; nor shall I call up any of the arguments upon which the famous decision was rendered. But I shall put the matter from a practical standpoint, with the hope that it may appeal to conscientious men. I say, therefore, to our separated brethren: You honestly believe in the validity of your Orders. But you must admit that the vast majority of Christians, many of them quite as capable as you, having before them the very arguments that you have, are unable to agree with you. It is the case of a vast multitude against a few.

I am aware that truth is not a question of majorities. But here you have the entire Catholic Church and the entire Greek Church, with their vast array of theologians, on one side, and what is, comparatively, but a handful of Anglicans and Episcopalians on the other. The former have all the information that the latter have, also pos-

ness as great ability; and yet this great majority is emphatic in denying what the minority affirms.

I shall not ask you to admit that you are wrong. But, I think, common sense must show that the validity which you claim is, at least, doubtful. If doubtful, are you at liberty to be satisfied with it?

If your Orders are doubtful, so are your Confirmation, your Penance, your Eucharist. Can you afford to give to those who seek your ministration, sacraments of doubtful validity? A conscientious doctor will not give doubtful treatment, or doubtful drugs, to his patient, if he can help it. Surely in treating the souls of men and women, equal care must be taken.

Granted that you are not able to do better by them. Then, it devolves on you to do what a conscientious physician, who feels himself unequal to the difficulties of a case, does. He sends the patient to some one whom he believes competent. If you are not certain of the sacraments you administer, and your spiritual patients desire the sacraments, why not follow the example of the conscientious physician, and send them to those who administer sacraments, conceded by all to be valid? Remember you are dealing with the

souls of men and women who trust you. Is it right, in a matter of supreme importance, to follow a course which the vast majority of men feel compelled to condemn as unsafe?

WHY DOES NOT THE CHURCH YIELD A LITTLE?

This question is frequently asked, sometimes even by Catholics. This is the age of compromise, they say. It is the age of organization, and organization, no matter where it may exist, demands that individuals allow their angularities to be reduced in order that they may fit in. The era of stiff principle and individualism has passed. If we are to accomplish anything we must come to terms, thereby giving up some of our pet theories and impractical views. If it be so in the world, why not in the Church?

It is all right to maintain the sanctity of marriage and the indissolubility of the bond. But here, one will say, is a case that demands exceptional treatment. There is present an incompatibility that is insuperable. Force this couple to live together and you provoke murder. Allow them to separate, but refuse them permission to enter into a new alliance, and you expose them to all manner of temptation. Why not then be

practical and permit divorce, to be followed by remarriage? They will thus be enabled to live reputable lives, become useful, if not ideal, citizens, who, in gratitude for the concession, will serve Church and State splendidly as long as they live. Let the Church be reasonable and get the best out of each situation. Again, why not come to some understanding with, for instance, such Episcopalians as desire union? They are willing to make many concessions, even some submissions. An understanding with them would increase materially the Church's influence for good in a time when such influence is so necessary. So in other matters. A spirit of accommodation should regulate the policy of the Church, in this twentieth century. Plausible reasoning, this surely is, but only plausible.

Those who desire compromise on the marriage bond forget that the Church has nothing to do with the matter. Christ made marriage indissoluble, and the Church has no power to undo the work of Christ. If she should attempt any such impiety she would forfeit her claim to be a teacher of truth; and further, her compromise would avail not at all. The marriage bond would

be as indissoluble after her false decision as before. Similarly, should the Church compromise any of the things that essentially belong to her, she should again be interfering with things over which she has no jurisdiction, and would once more act in vain. Were it possible for her to take such a step, the Church would, by the very act, cease to be the Church of Christ; and, if this were possible, Christ's promises as to her permanence and inerrancy would be proven false. If the surrender, that Episcopalians sometimes ask, as a condition of reunion, were made they would not be uniting themselves to the Church of Christ, but to one that had forsaken its Divine Founder.

When it comes to a question of compromise the demand most frequently made is that the Church abandon the Pope; in other words, assume the attitude of an acephalous body. It is strange that many of these good men, who hold in horror the conduct of Henry VIII, adopt precisely the principles which he originated. He, too, would accept the Catholic Church, but without the Pope. Catholics, at least, should know that the Church is not author of her own being, nor of her essential qualities, nor of her sacraments. All these

come from the Founder and are not subject to change. The Church's duty is to protect and to proclaim what has been entrusted to her. Any other course were treason; and from a practical point of view, ineffectual. The *non possumus* of Rome, then, means precisely what it says: "WE CANNOT." We are without power in a matter upon which there is Divine Ruling.

THE PRESENT PROSPECTS OF CATHOLICISM

When one leaves the world of facts and enters the field of forecast, he gives up the certain for the probable. He may even lapse into the improbable. If his speculation is to be anything more than guesswork he must see the future in the activities of the present.

The writer does not claim any special knowledge of contemporary conditions. Hence, if some dispute his estimate he has no fault to find. His reason for writing this article is—apart from the fact that some one suggests it—that he finds it an interesting speculation and one that will, no doubt, soon receive attention from more competent thinkers.

It is not at all probable that the Church will be called upon to get ready at once for large accessions to the fold. Nations do not come to us as in the early days. Conversion is an individual work. Further, it is not a mere matter of intellectual conviction, but a complete change of the

soul's attitude towards the present and the future. This requires Divine aid.

The Church has acquitted herself well during the war. It did not, indeed, prevent or stop the conflict, as some thought it should have. But if it failed to answer such expectations it was for the very good reason that it was not allowed to interfere in the matter. Nor is it allowed to enter into the work of making peace. But it must be admitted that, while it did not accomplish the impossible, it has done everything in its power to relieve suffering and to mitigate the horrors of strife. Its children, in spite of some great difficulties, were loyal in every land.

To what extent will this record help? In our own land the Church manifested its interest from the beginning. No organization surpassed it either in devotion or promptitude; and the Knights of Columbus have won the gratitude of every soldier of our expeditionary armies. This ought to help, and no doubt will help. But do not the very praises bestowed upon Catholic effort stir up a jealousy which is even now manifesting itself in various ways? We all realize that there are presently at work hostile agencies,

which have not yet perfected their plans, but which, apparently, are bent upon interfering with our schools, if not actually closing them. In spite of our unsurpassed loyalty, the time is fraught with danger to our institutions. We are not, of course, afraid; but we must be alert, and prepared to meet bigotry and narrowness with resolution and intelligence. Yet from the whole situation I infer that while we need not expect a considerable influx, still the number of converts will grow and increase.

WHAT ABOUT FRANCE?

In the first months of the war the clergy had shown such unparalleled devotion that the world began to see a governmental change of heart already in progress. This change, later, became accelerated by the distinguished services of Catholic Generals, and, still later, by the achievements of Commander-in-Chief Foch, who is the first Catholic layman in the world of today.

But, apparently, a determined effort is now being made to check the tide that was turning in favor of the Church; and the centralization of power at Paris, which since the days of Richelieu,

has been so characteristic of France, will be able to maintain the intolerable atheism that has so long ruled the country. Gain there will be, ultimately, great gain, but it will not come as quickly or be as abundant as one might expect.

It is not easy for an outsider to understand French Catholicity. Some wonder how it happened that the French Church of former days went so far without going further. Had it been on the Bosphorus it would, probably, be long ago in schism, as is the Greek Church. French Catholics, in spite of great talents and great virtues, have always worshiped France,—the soil and the Government. The latter deity has repaid their devotion with dire persecution. The condition of the Church in France will, no doubt, improve, but I fear that rampant atheism will rule the Republic for many years.

WHAT OF CENTRAL EUROPE?

The Catholic Church found the Berlin atmosphere very chilly. The State Church entered very little into the lives of the people, and, when it did claim admittance, it had very little to bring or to give. Generally speaking, it was only when

it was forced to think of the Catholic Church that it felt itself a religion. Religio-political hostility to Rome was its chief inspiration.

The great power upon which it rested is now fallen, and it is very doubtful if the ecclesiastical edifice will long survive its late defender. But I should not expect too much from the changed situation. The artificial combination of Lutheranism and Calvinism, which the State Religion of Prussia was, will certainly no longer be able to despise, as it habitually despised, the Catholic Church. But Berlin has been for long the home of infidelity and atheism, and it is doubtful if these evil forces have weakened during the trying conditions that are now passing. However, this much is true: Protestantism has lost its chief support in Prussia and in Germany, and the opportunity opened to the Catholic Church in the Fatherland will be great, especially when Bolshevism shall have disappeared. What the Catholic Church will in the near future need is a scholarly clergy, and the works of Wasmann, Denifle and some others, indicate that this need will be supplied. When peace and normal conditions have returned, there ought to be a great

field for Catholic endeavor in the Protestant states of Germany. The work will be difficult, but full of promise.

The Scandinavian Nations will be found impervious for years to come.

WHAT OF RUSSIA?

We doubt if ever a Christian people were so humiliated as the Russian Nation is under the present Bolshevik Government. The nationalization of women is an atrocity so enormous that, not even the Turk in all his abominable lusts, has ever attempted it. The degradation is so awful that the Government guilty of it can hardly continue in power for any considerable time. Russia will be saved, after the Russian Church, which, too, worshiped the secular power, has been duly chastised by its god.

Russia is a religious nation, and virtuous. It was separated by force, and kept separated by force and imposed ignorance, from the center of unity. It will not return easily or quickly. Long years of schism have builded many barriers to union. But the chief obstacle, the Tsar, is gone. The Holy Synod is no longer absolute under him.

There ought, therefore, be a great opportunity for the Catholic Church in the years to come. But the moment has not yet arrived.

The Balkan States will be influenced very much by what Russia does. Greece will not be affected in the near future. Constantinople, and its environments, will depend very much upon the disposition made of them in the Peace Conference.

ARMENIA

That undefined territory which we call Armenia, whose population has suffered such awful affliction, will offer a promising field for far-seeing Catholic endeavor. The Sovereign Pontiff has manifested the keenest interest in, and has brought, whenever possible, genuine relief to this sorely tried people. Gratitude ought to remove much of the national stubbornness that manifested itself so early and survived so long. Heresies of Eastern origin are still extant among them.

But the average Armenian scarcely knows what they mean. Protestant Missionaries have been quite successful in securing converts from

them, by appealing to their national cupidity. But still Armenia is a promising field. It has been long separated from Christian unity and has suffered thereby. The sacrifices it has made, and the sufferings it has endured, will possibly prepare it for a return to the fold.

The great hope of the Catholic Church lies in the fact that most of the governments that have stood for national religions have fallen to rise no more. A great obstacle to Christian unity is thus removed. A fair field is what the Church asks. This, with the zeal that made the Counter-Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries possible, ought to bring success. Nations will have some religion, and the only religion that can stand the test of enlightenment is the Catholic.

The Irish (or Maynooth) Mission to China is full of promise. The most upright people of the Orient are the Chinese. No obstacle is interposed to missionary effort among them. Indeed, Catholic Missions in that populous land have been singularly successful. The Irish clergy have taken up the evangelization of this benighted land with their old-time spirit, and very much

may be expected from their efforts. I conclude, then, that, though there will be little done in the next few years, and while there will be no Pentecostal accessions, before a decade has passed much progress will be made both in Europe and in Asia. This advance will be of a steady nature, and will continue with unabated vigor. I base my forecast upon facts already mentioned—the natural honesty of peoples freed from tyranny and deception, the general craving for religion, and the fact that, in my judgment, there is but one religion that can stand the test of the future, as there is but one that has stood, or could stand, the trials of the past. The Catholic Church that survived the Cæsars, that buried Arianism, that now looks upon Protestantism's lapse from a supernatural religion to the position of a strong secular organization, can confidently address itself to the problems of the future. The Counter-Reformation spirit still lives, and is prepared to accomplish great things for God and humanity.

A FINAL WORD

I have already indicated the reasons that prompted the seven discourses which form the first part of this volume. The constant and unabashed misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine and history, of which local schools have been persistently guilty, demanded that something should be said in reply. Catholic young people have been obliged to listen to men and women who neither know, nor care to know, the other side. Nurtured on prejudice, teachers poured out the traditional Protestant view which, having secured prescriptive right in England, has been carried bodily to this country. Neither the College nor the High-School professor feels called upon to question the stories which, for four hundred years, English Protestantism has made do duty for history.

A typical instance of the recklessness, with which the old-time professor handles facts and theories, came to my attention the other day. One who has a habit of knocking the bottom out

of Catholicism every now and again, discussed, for his class, the claims of the Roman Pontiff to be the successor of St. Peter. He was able to assure his pupils that Papal pretensions in this matter are idle, as Peter never was in Rome.

The intelligent reader may ask why I should bother with one who has the hardihood (or the ignorance) to question what is universally conceded by scholars. My answer is that the young people who listened to the lecture take the professor's story for granted, and will not consult even an encyclopædia. Not, indeed, that it means much to them; for the most of them do not know the significance of the fact so confidently denied by their professor. But here we find the genuine Protestant type of teacher; a type that, in spite of modern scholarship, is still with us; ready to mislead those who are paying him for instruction, if only he can propagate fond views.

The world has today, as it has had for four hundred years, many of the class. Not what is true, but what one can make pass as true—"put over," as modern slang has it—is their motto.

Yet, perhaps, we ought not to blame the type too much. For without straining a point, they

can find justification for their attitude in Reformation principles. These assuredly recognize private judgment and all its findings. If we are entitled to think as we please about God, and His Christ, also about His Church, why may we not exercise the same right in dealing with questions of history? What is there sacred about the movements of St. Peter that entitle them to more than we concede to the word of God? If private judgment be the rule in one case, why not in the other?

We have heard the theory advanced, even in our day, that belief varies, and rightly varies, with the age, condition of enlightenment, climate, etc. And it is good Protestantism to hold that it may vary with the individual. Luther's theory, carried to its logical conclusion, makes allowance for as many views on a given subject as there are people to view it—and all equally true. In other words, there is no truth, but only opinion. What we call truth is something merely in the mind, and implies no objective reality.

Now, the introduction of principles, which govern the soul's relations with God, into the affairs of life, history, etc., can hardly be held as improper treatment of these subjects. Hence,

what you THINK is right and true. The professor, therefore, who can "put over" any view about St. Peter's never having come to Rome, never having been given the Primacy, or about any other subject, sacred or profane, is a worthy child of the Reformation.

INDEX

- Alexander, Rev. William Lindsay,
in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*
quoted on Calvin's doctrines, 55,
56
- Alexander VI, 13
- Anabaptists, 47, 48, 50
- Anne, Queen, 107 et passim
- Anti-Pope, elected by French influ-
ence in fourteenth century, 12
- Armenians and Catholicism, 235
- Arminius and the Arminian "here-
sy," 145
- Augaburg, Peace of, 188, 190, 192
- Augustine, St., and the Pelagian
heresy, 59 et passim
- Avignon, 11, 12
- Babylonian, Captivity, 11, 12
- Baronius, Cardinal, 151
- Beaton, Cardinal, 117
- Belgium, 144
- Bible, 196, 197
- Luther's Bible, 43
- Birth control, 207, 208
- Boleyn, Anne, 66 et passim
- Borromeo, St. Charles, 147, 155
- Boyne, Battle of the, 100
- Burke, Edmund
quoted on the penal code of Ire-
land, 101
- Calvin, John, 46 et passim
- Cambridge Modern History
quoted on Luther, 35, 40
quoted on the Reformation, 41
quoted on Calvin, 50, 51
quoted on the necessity of reform,
152
- Capital and Labor, 204, 205
- Catherine of Aragon, 65 et passim
- Central Europe and the Catholic
Church, 232
- Charles I, 95, 96
- Charles II, 100
- Chesterton, G. K.
quoted on Henry VIII, 74
- Chinese and Catholicism, 236
- Chrysoloras, Manuel, 17
- Church of England, 172 et passim
- Clement V, 11
- Clergy, condition of, at outbreak of
Reformation, 14 et passim
- Cobbet, 9
- "Cock-pit of Europe," 144
- Copenhagen, Diet of, 135
- Council of Trent, 10, 13, 14, 150
- Cranmer, 67 et passim
- Cromwell, Oliver, 96 et passim
- Cromwell, Thomas, 68 et passim, 87
et passim
- Cujus regio ejus religio, 40, 133, 188
- Diet of Copenhagen, 135
- Divorce, Protestant churches and,
205, 206
- Drogheda, 97
- Dutch Republic founded, 144
- Eck, Luther and, 20
- Edict of Nantes, 132
- Education, secularization of, 203,
204
- Edward VI, 75, 76
- Elizabeth, Queen of England, 77 et
passim
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*
quoted on Luther, 33, 34, 37
quoted on Calvin, 52, 55, 56
quoted on Mary, Queen of Eng-
land, 76
quoted on Elizabeth, 79
quoted on Elizabeth's work in Ire-
land, 93, 94
quoted on James I's work in Ire-
land, 95
quoted on Charles I, 96
quoted on Scotland, 122, 123
quoted on James I and Scotland,
127
quoted on Denmark, 135
quoted on Norway, 137
quoted on Sweden, 140, 141
quoted on the Seminary system,
151
quoted on the Thirty Years' War,
190
- Episcopal Church, 219
- Episcopalians, 64
- Erasmus, 33
- Fairbairn, Dr., in *Cambridge Mod-
ern History*
quoted on Calvin, 50, 51
- Finland, Reformation in, 142
- Fisher, Bishop, 72
- Fox, George, 182
- France and the Catholic Church, 231
- Francis I, 130
- Francis II, 131
- Free-Will, Effects of doctrines
against, 147
- Froude, James A.
quoted on Calvin's doctrines, 57
- Gallican Liberties, 130
- Geneva under Calvin, 52, 53
- Green, Mrs. J. R.
quoted on Ireland, 89 et passim

- Green, J. R.
 quoted on Luther, 38
 quoted on Cromwell, 73
 quoted on Elizabeth, 78, 79, 82, 83
 quoted on Ireland under Cromwell, 99, 100
- Gregory XI, 12
- Grieve, Rev. A. J., in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*
 quoted on Calvin's doctrines, 55, 56
- Guizot
 quoted on Elizabeth, 84, 85
 quoted on Ireland under Cromwell, 98, 99
- Hallam
 quoted on Luther, 32, 37, 38
 quoted on Henry VIII, 72
 quoted on Ireland under William and Mary, 109
 quoted on Knox, 123
 Henry VIII, 64 et passim
 "Higher Criticism," 186
- Huguenots, 131 et passim
- Hulme, Edward Maslin
 quoted on the Reformation, 31
 quoted on Luther, 36, 37, 39, 41
- Iceland, Reformation in, 142
- Ignatius, St., 147
- Inconsistency of Protestantism, 163
- Indulgences, Preaching of, 25
- International Encyclopaedia
 quoted on the Reformation, 9
 quoted on the Thirty Years' War, 192
- James I and Ireland, 94, 95
 and Scotland, 126 et passim
- James II, 100
- Jesuits, 152
- Johannes Magni, 140
- Johnson, A. H.
 quoted on Calvin's doctrines, 57
- Karlstadt, 134
- Kirk, Presbyterian, 123
- Knox, John, 144 et passim
- Labor, Capital and, 204, 205
- Landgrave of Hesse, Philip, 33, 34
- League of Nations, 201
- Lecky
 quoted on Ireland, 91
 quoted on the Thirty Years' War, 191
- Leo X., 13, 18, 21
- Limerick, Treaty of, 101, 102
- Lindsay, Dr., in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*
 quoted on Luther, 33, 34, 37
- Luther, Martin, 10, 18, 21 et passim
- Lutherans in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, 134
- Macaulay, Lord
 quoted on English Reformation, 71
- Macaulay, Lord
 quoted on Elizabeth and the Church, 79, 80
 quoted on Ireland, 94, 98, 103 et passim
 quoted on progress of Catholicism, 153
- Marriage, 198
- Martin V., 13
- Mary, Queen of England, 76 et passim
- Mary, Queen of Scots, 83, 114 et passim
- Mennonites, 166
- Misrepresentations necessary to Protestant sects, 160
- Morality, sexual, 208 et passim
- More, Sir Thomas, 18, 72
- Mystic, Definition of, 18
- Nantes, Edict of, 132
- Neri, St. Philip, 147, 153
- Oath of Supremacy, 88
- Peasant's Revolt, 19, 29
- Pelagius and the Pelagian heresy, 59 et passim
- Pilgrim Fathers, 171
- Pilgrimage of Grace, 70, 74
- Pisa, Council of, 12
- Plantation of Ulster, 94
- Praemunire, 70
- Predestination, Effects of doctrine of, 148
- Priest-hunters, 110, 111
- Private judgment, 195, 213
- Propaganda, College of the, 156
- Protestantism, Outlook of, 157, 158
- Reformers, Character of the, 146, 148
- Rienhard, 134
- Renaissance, 16 et passim
- Russia and the Catholic Church, 234
- Seminary system, the, 151
- Servetus, 52
- Six Articles, Statute of the, 69, 70
- St. Bartholomew, Massacre of, 131
- Suarez, 151
- Tetzel, 21
- Thirty Years' War, 153
- Tractarian Movement, 174
- Trent, Council of, 10, 13, 14, 150
- Unitarians, 61
- Unity, Christian, 194, 195
- War, The World, 198, 201
- Wesley, John, 175 et passim
- Western Schism, 12
- Westphalia, Peace of, 190
- Whitefield, George, 175 et passim
- William and Mary, 103 et passim
- Wishart, George, 117
- Worldliness of Protestantism, 197
- Xavier, St. Francis, 147, 156
- Zwingli, Ulrich, 46, 49

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine is incurred by retaining it
beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

OCT 25 1966 H

1198-062

C 7519.19.10

The reformation,
Widener Library

003637590



3 2044 081 800 849